HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

MARCH 1953 PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—What are We to Teach about Christ's Second Advent?—Locate It in Time?—Treat It as Unimportant?—The Truth for which the Concept of the Second Advent Stands—The *Kerygma*—Effective Evangelism. 161

II. BOOKS ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST: THE CHRISTOLOGY OF LEONARD HODGSON'S 'DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.' By the Reverend Dennis Nineham, M.A., Fellow of The Queen's College, Oxford 164

III. LITERATURE 168

IV. JESUS' OWN THOUGHTS ABOUT HIS DEATH. By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Glasgow 174

V. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 178
2. The Christian Year 180

VI. THE REARRANGEMENT AND TRANSMISSION OF MARK IX. 11–13. By the Reverend C. Clare Oke, M.A., Th.D., Dover Centre, Ontario 187

VII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. The Kingdom of God has Come. By the Reverend Martin A. Simpson, M.A., Wiston, Biggar 188
2. Does Aretas Belong in 2 Corinthians or Galatians? By the Reverend Eric F. F. Bishop, The University, Glasgow 188
3. *Casus Pendens.* By G. M. Lee, B.A., Bedford 189

VIII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 189

IX. ENTRE NOUS—Religious Education: The Use of the Bible in the School—Archaeology for Children 191

VOLUME LXIV. No. 6

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH

EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

NATIONALITY

or denomination is not our first concern as publishers. Perhaps it is unfashionable of us not to ask a would-be author the story of his affiliations before we accept his manuscript. But when the deed is done and the book is about to appear, it can be an interesting study to see whence our authors hail. Scotland and the Continent of Europe are well to the fore in our current list with David Cairns' Kerr Lectures THE IMAGE OF GOD IN MAN (18s net); Oscar Cullmann's EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP (8s net, translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance); A. M. Hunter's DESIGN FOR LIFE, a study of the Sermon on the Mount (7s 6d net); Karl Heim's two big books CHRISTIAN FAITH AND NATURAL SCIENCE and THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SCIENTIFIC WORLD VIEW (21s net each); and Alasdair MacIntyre's MARXISM: An Interpretation (8s 6d net). Dr. J. H. Oldham can still be claimed by Scotland and his book LIFE IS COMMITMENT (12s 6d net) is an important essay in theological thinking.

But the truth is, we are only mildly interested in the genealogy of our authors. We ask rather whether they have a real contribution to make to problems which transcend nationality; and we bring them into our fold, from all the airts.

SCM PRESS

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

We conceive it to be the purpose of these columns in The Expository Times not only to pick out for exposition ideas or insights from individual books but also, from time to time, to notice new trends or currents in the theological thought of our time. With this purpose in mind, we were recently surveying some of the most notable publications in the last year or two: Cullmann's *Christ and Time*, Baillie's *Belief in Progress*, Galloway's *Cosmic Christ*, John Robinson's *In the End, God*, William Manson's *Hebrews*, Oliver Quick's posthumous *Gospel of the New World*, and so on. What struck us most vividly was not simply the renascence of eschatology but the revival of interest in what is commonly called 'the Second Advent.'

Fifty years ago, or even less, our pundits took a very different view. If they did not seek to get rid of the doctrine altogether on the ground that it was no part of the permanent message of Christ and His apostles, they skated over the subject in the most perfunctory manner. Now, our theological leaders seem to be resolved that we take the idea very seriously indeed. Part of the reason for the renewed interest in eschatology is no doubt the fact that we have been living through apocalyptic times, when the very foundations of our civilization have been profoundly shaken. Part of the reason also is the fact that our New Testament scholars have proved that the apostolic gospel is shot through with eschatology, so that the man who refuses the eschatological key cannot begin to understand it aright. And part of the reason is the fact that with the advent of the A and (still more) the H bomb the end of the world has become, for many minds, a live possibility. At any rate, our theologians are determined that as Christians we should give more serious thought to the ideas of the end of the world and the coming of Christ or, in other words, that we should begin again to think eschatologically.

As yet, however, all this has not percolated down to the man in the pew, or even to many of the clergy. Among the rank and file of our church members only the vaguest notions prevail about the Biblical doctrine of the Last Things; and our ministers, so far from preaching often about the Second Advent, tend in choosing hymns to fight shy of those which sing about it in, let us say, the Pauline manner, preferring instead items like Julia Ward Howe's 'Mine eyes have seen the glory.'

This attitude to the doctrine is undoubtedly a concession to what they believe to be the *Zeitgeist*: they fear to invite their congregations to sing about something in which the modern man may no longer be expected to believe. But it is sometimes a mistaken fear. We heard only the other day that one of the ablest women in the Church of Scotland had seriously considered leaving the Church because it apparently no longer reckoned the Second Advent among 'the things most surely believed.'

The truth is, as Dr. John Robinson and others have recently said, that the only question of an eschatological kind in which the average church member is really interested is that of personal immortality. That is why we have many books on the question of life after death (one or two of them pre-eminently good) but, save in Fundamentalist circles, few if any books which reflect with any fidelity the New Testament teaching about the Christian Hope in its cosmic aspects.

It appears to us, therefore, that one of the major theological tasks before the Church is that of rethinking the whole issue of Christian eschatology. The task is urgent for three reasons. For one thing, the New Testament gospel, as our scholars have been telling us insistently, is nothing if not eschatological. For a second reason, a Christianity which has no proper eschatological hope has in more senses than one, no future before it. And, finally, we know only too well from the history of our own times that if religion does not furnish men with an adequate and worthy hope of this kind

they will speedily discover for themselves secular substitutes. Hitler's '*Reich* that would last for a thousand years' was one. Mussolini's dream of a new and greater Roman Empire was another. And what if not a secular substitute is Communism's myth of a classless society?

So much, then, for the general problem of eschatology. Now let us revert to our particular one: What are we, as Christians who take the New Testament as our standard, to believe and teach about the Second Advent?

St. Paul and the other apostles, as we all know, ardently believed in the *Parousia*; indeed, they thought it very near. The event proved them mistaken. Christ did not come back as they evidently expected He would—has not yet come back in that sense. A later New Testament writer, however, made the wise suggestion that perhaps in a case of this kind ordinary time-measurements are inapplicable: 'one day with the Lord is as a thousand years.' Further, certain sayings of Jesus Himself suggest that the Day of the Son of man is, strictly speaking, dateless, since it lies beyond the dissolution of the universe and the end of history as we know it. Does this mean that the doctrine of Christ's Second Advent is of no concern to us who are creatures of time? On the contrary. Two things, Reinhold Niebuhr says, we may not do with it—take it literally or dismiss it as unimportant. Take it literally—locate it in time (which conceptually you cannot do)—and you make the ultimate vindication of God *over* history into a mere point *in* history. Treat it as unimportant, and you produce a view of eternity which negates, not fulfils, the process of history. No, we cannot dispense with the truth for which the concept of the Second Advent stands.

What, then, are we to say about it? Three things, we suggest. First, belief in the Second Advent of Christ represents our conviction that the Lord of history, who is none other than the Father of Christ, will complete His work of redemption. Second, we should think of the Advent not as an event in history but as the point at which all history—and all the achievements and struggles of man—are taken up into the eternal purpose of God. And, third, our clue to its nature is the First Coming of Christ. God has already revealed Himself to us in a Man by whom all men may know what sort of a Person it is with whom, at history's end, we have to do. When the scroll of history is wound up, there will be nothing contrary to what Christ disclosed at His First Advent. We shall encounter the same Person whose holiness and love we have already known in Christ; and if we have to stand before His tribunal, we may believe that the sign of the Cross will be over all.

This is, in substance, the view of Christ's Coming set forth in C. H. Dodd's *Coming of Christ*. Professor Barth, we believe, has expressed his complete agreement with it. Is it not worth the consideration of us lesser mortals who would fain be true to the New Testament faith?

In the current periodical theological literature there appear two articles which at first sight seem widely different and which are yet closely interrelated. The first is an important article in *The Hibbert Journal* of January, 1953, by the Rev. T. F. GLASSON, M.A., D.D., entitled 'The Kerygma: Is our Version Correct?' It is the now familiar practice to refer to the original apostolic message as the *Kerygma*. The summary of the contents of that message is stereotyped into this form. 'The time of fulfilment has come, the new age has been inaugurated by the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus, who is now at the right hand of God; soon He will return in glory to judge the world; repent and believe in the good news and you will receive forgiveness and the gift of the Holy Spirit.' This universally accepted version of the *Kerygma* is drawn from an examination of chs. 2, 3, 5, 10, 13 of Acts. Now Dr. GLASSON holds—and he proves his case—that the commonly accepted version of the *Kerygma* omits one thing that appears in all these five places and includes one that is only found in one of them.

The thing which is generally omitted and which Dr. GLASSON would include is the idea of *the apostles as witnesses*. In every one of these five Acts passages from which the *Kerygma* is drawn the idea of the apostles as witnesses occurs—Ac 2^{32} 3^{5} 5^{32} $10^{40.\ 41}$ $13^{30.\ 31}$. The *Kerygma* then is a proclamation of certain facts about Jesus *certified by witnesses*. This has certain interesting repercussions. It has long been held that the outline of St. Mark's Gospel is none other than the outline of the *Kerygma*. On this basis Professor R. H. Lightfoot holds that St. Mark's Gospel ends at 16^{18} for with that version the *Kerygma* is completed; but if the idea of witness be an essential part of the *Kerygma* then St. Mark's Gospel does not end at 16^{18} for the idea of witnesses to the Resurrection has not yet been introduced; and therefore it is still true to say that the end of the Gospel has been lost and Professor Lightfoot is wrong in his conclusions. That the witness idea

is part of the Pauline version of the *Kerygma* can be seen from a study of 1 Co 15^{1-11}; and in 15^{15} the word witness actually occurs. Dr. GLASSON has abundantly made out his case; the idea of apostolic witness is an essential part of the *Kerygma*.

The thing which is included in the usual version of the *Kerygma* and which yet does not appear at all in Ac 2, 3, 5, 13 is that *Christ is to judge the world*; it is found only in 10^{42} and to some extent in 3^{9}; nor does this idea occur in 1 Co 15. Now the *Kerygma* should include that which appears in every case and not that which only appears in some; it therefore becomes a question if the idea of the Second Coming of Christ in glory as judge should be included in the *Kerygma* at all. The view that 'the Early Church from the day of Pentecost onwards was possessed by an overpowering conviction that the return of Christ to judge the world was imminent' is therefore open to question.

Finally Dr. GLASSON finds the *Kerygma* with the addition and the omission he suggests in Lk 24^{46-48}. 'And he said unto them, (*a*) Thus it is written, (*b*) that the Christ should suffer, (*c*) and rise again from the dead the third day: (*d*) and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. (*e*) Ye are witnesses of these things.'

The other article to which we refer is in the January issue of *The Congregational Quarterly*. It is entitled 'Effective Evangelism' and is from the unpublished literary remains of the late Rev. J. S. GRIFFITH, M.A., B.D. This article deals with the presentation of the Christian message and may therefore fitly be read beside an article on the *Kerygma*. The preacher's message 'must be news of God, not news of earth; not what a man proposes to do or hopes to do, but what God has done and is doing.' The preacher's aim must be 'to open the way for traffic between God and man.' 'To establish that contact between those who listen, and God, in whose name we preach, is the responsibility of the preacher of the gospel.' The preacher may fail to do this in two ways. First, 'We may speak the word of God, but leave those who hear spectators only.' It is possible to preach completely irrelevantly to a congregation and to speak a message rather to those who are not there than to those who are. Second, the aim may be 'an appeal to thought only and not to life.' 'Our challenge is not "what think ye of Christ?" but "what are you going to do about Him?"' 'The aim of preaching is something beyond arriving at truth; it is to achieve contact with reality.' 'The perilous and the awful post' of the preacher is to stand at 'the point where the eternal powers of the unseen world are waiting to find entrance through us into the human heart.' Standing as he does there, the preacher cannot but be conscious of his own insufficiency but 'behind him are the powers of the eternal world and the glory of the Lord. He has God's message to deliver. . . . Preacher and message may not win favour with the world; that does not alter the case. It is not the preacher's business to reconcile God to the world but to reconcile the world to God.' To that end 'there must be both sturdiness and steadiness in the proclamation.'

The preacher's message must not only be that God exists but that 'He exists to care for men.' The study of the world will tell you that God has a mind but only the message of Christ assures us that God has a heart. Jesus, and Jesus alone, 'makes it possible for me to associate love with God, both on my side and on God's, and so brings a new power and control into my life.' This is so because 'God is what Jesus was.' 'The identity of God with Jesus is the best news there is and can be for mortal man.'

To be effective this message must be 'addressed to the centre of man's being, his soul.' 'It must quicken in man that sense that he has a soul, and that his soul is more important than anything else about him.' If that be so 'nothing really serious can happen to us but sin.' And the gospel is the eternal God speaking to the eternal in man. 'The Cross stands to tell that whatever else makes light of sin God does not.' The Cross teaches us that 'God *has* taken action, He *did* come into the field—that field where man's future is at stake and his soul in jeopardy.' And that action is supremely effective for us, for it makes us His—'whoever else and whatever else may claim us.' Here is the *Kerygma* which the modern preacher must announce to men.

Books on the Person of Christ

The Christology of Leonard Hodgson's 'Doctrine of the Trinity'

By the Reverend Dennis Nineham, M.A., Fellow of The Queen's College, Oxford

To attempt to expound a writer's Christology simply on the basis of a book written expressly about the Trinity would be a rash undertaking. Fortunately in Professor Hodgson's case it is unnecessary, seeing that he has treated explicitly of the Incarnation in some of his earlier writings.[1] Accordingly in what follows, these earlier writings have been freely drawn on where necessary to supplement or amplify shorter statements in the present book.

Professor Hodgson starts from the traditional view that Christian doctrine, both Trinitarian and Christological, is based on revelation. But he has his own distinctive and clearly formulated account of revelation, and this we must first discuss, for it controls both the method and content of much of his thinking. He diverges sharply from the traditional account of the mode of revelation. God's method, he thinks, was not to dictate to inspired authors a series of propositions such that, if properly arranged and understood, they provide a direct account of His being and actions, but rather to reveal Himself in a person. The revelation was in the historical figure Jesus Christ, or rather Jesus Christ as the New Testament bears witness to Him *was* the revelation. It follows that the way to appropriate the revelation is not by concentrating on the propositions of the Biblical text as such and trying to make them yield new meanings by such methods as allegorical or 'spiritual' interpretation, but by meditating on the historical events of Christ's life, death, and resurrection, and drawing conclusions from them under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Professor Hodgson's book is just such a meditation.

It begins by outlining a meditative method adapted to the view of revelation just described. First, all the resources of Biblical scholarship must be employed to help us form as accurate a picture as possible of the historical figure of Jesus Christ. When we examine the figure thus revealed the thing that most strikes us about Him is His complete humanity. There are no erratic blocks, as it were, in the structure of His humanity, which refuse to be brought under the description 'human' in any sense and force us to classify them as sheerly supernatural. There were no irruptions of naked divinity in Christ's life; even in the case of the miracles, where they are correctly reported, the Divine power is seen to have been mediated through a fully human agency. They were acts of power such as might well be within the competence of perfect humanity in completely obedient dependence upon God.

Indeed at first it was hardly realized that Jesus was anything more than human. But even His earliest disciples as they reflected about Him could not help seeing in His person, fully human though it was, depths of content far beyond anything known to them in their other experience of humanity. At first, being Jews, they used Jewish imagery and the dramatic language of time and space to express this realization, speaking of Him as Messiah and Son of Man and representing Him as having pre-existed before His birth at Bethlehem. Such dramatic representations quickly multiplied, but all proved inadequate in one respect or another, and the final stage of the process was not reached till Nicea when, in the *homoousios*, the Church proclaimed its eventual recognition that this fully human life was the earthly life of One who was somehow essentially different from any human being; that it was in fact the life of God Himself lived under the conditions of time and space.

In the light of this we can see how to proceed with our meditation; for if we 'think away'[2] from the accounts of Christ's earthly life all the elements in it which are purely incidental to, and conditioned by, the circumstances of life in the flesh, the remaining attitudes and patterns of behaviour can legitimately be 'projected into eternity'[2] to form the basis of our conception of God as He is in Himself.

When the New Testament picture of Christ is looked at in this way there is one element which certainly cannot be 'thought away' as belonging simply to this world, namely the fact of His continual relatedness to other Divine persons. He is portrayed as in continual relation to one other Divine person whom He called 'my Father,' and that in the power of a second Divine person described as the Spirit. Professor Hodgson more than once sums up the New Testament picture of Christ as that of 'One who sought to find and do the Father's will in the Father's world through the indwelling Spirit by whom He was one with

[1] Notably in his book *And Was Made Man* [1928] and his essay on 'The Incarnation' in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson [1928].

[2] The phrase is Professor Hodgson's.

the Father.' [1] Thus the life of Christ, though it was Divine, was not the whole life of Divinity. Christ was a Divine person, but there are clearly two other Divine persons as well. And if we are to take Christ as the basis of our judgment, the word 'person' in all three cases must be given the full meaning it normally has in modern parlance. To say that is at once to raise the problem of the unity of the Godhead, and not the least interesting thing in Professor Hodgson's book is his careful analysis of the various possible understandings of unity and his suggestion that 'organic' or 'internally constitutive' unity may be a better model for the theologian than the mere absence of multiplicity which is the mathematician's ideal. From the mathematician's point of view there must always no doubt be something 'imperfect' about organic unities, for, though in one sense they are arithmetical unities, they only exist as unifying the various elements of which they are composed, and these elements can only play their part in the one common life if they are, and remain, distinct from, and complementary to, one another. But despite the mathematician, the organic, and ultimately mysterious, unity which holds together the various elements of a human being in a single life-history, may well be the best analogue—it is no more—of that living unity which binds together the persons of the Godhead in a oneness of inconceivable intensity.

On such a view full justice can be done to the complete equality of the persons without any of the subordinationism that has been introduced into theology by the vain search for mathematical unity. About the precise nature of the 'internally constitutive' unity by which the three fully equal persons are bound together Professor Hodgson acknowledges a robust agnosticism. He has, he says, 'not the least idea what is meant by either filiation or procession in respect of the divine Being,' and he thinks it would be idle to search for alternative terms.

It is into this framework that Professor Hodgson's Christology is fitted, and that fact in itself to some extent controls its character. In the light of his insistence on the full equality and full personality of the persons of the Godhead Professor Hodgson can say simply that Jesus Christ was one of these persons—can it make any difference to Him which?—living a human life. But simple though it sounds, such a formula is bound to provoke a number of questions from any one acquainted with the history of Christological controversies.

Before Professor Hodgson's answers to these questions can be fully appreciated we must state an axiom by which they will all be seen to be governed. It is to the effect that the notions of Godhead and manhood with which we operate in discussing the Biblical revelation must themselves be derived from that revelation. It is wrong to suppose that we know on some general, *a priori*, grounds what Godhead and humanity are and then to interpret, or misinterpret, the revelation in terms of these man-made definitions. Working on the basis of this axiom Professor Hodgson arrives at the following definition of humanity: 'to be human is to be the self-conscious subject of experiences mediated through a body in the world of time and space.' That will serve to explain the sense in which Professor Hodgson speaks of the second Person of the Trinity 'living a human life' and so to define one side of his Christology.

When applied to the nature of deity, Professor Hodgson's axiom has more far-reaching results and brings him into conflict with traditional thought about God in at least one important particular; it leads him to deny at least one part of the doctrine of Divine impassibility. While fully appreciating the reasons which led Plato and his successors to posit the complete *apatheia* of God as He is in Himself, Professor Hodgson believes that we are compelled by the Biblical account of creation to admit also that, in relation to His creatures, God can and does limit His *apatheia*. The relative freedom and independence of man as over against God in the Biblical accounts seem to make this conclusion inescapable and it can be gainsaid, Professor Hodgson thinks, only by violating his axiom and misinterpreting the plain language of Scripture. Professor Hodgson does not profess to explain in detail how God can be thought of as at once impassible and limited, and in any case the problem is one which concerns the doctrine of creation rather than that of the Person of Christ. But it has an important bearing on Christology because, if it is agreed that the Divine *apatheia* has already been limited by the fact of creation, there is no difficulty in principle in supposing that it was also limited—though no doubt in a different and more radical way—for the purpose of the Incarnation. Professor Hodgson is thus delivered at one stroke from all the problems with which traditional Christology has been faced by its insistence that even in the Incarnation divinity remained inviolably impassible. These problems have been the very core of traditional Christological discussions and it is for that reason that Professor Hodgson's view seems simple to the point of naïveté beside them. But we must not be misled; this apparent naïveté is due, not to any failure to see the problems, but to a fully articulate conviction that they were in large part false problems, the result, simply, of pressing a

[1] The quotation is composite, made up from the slightly variant forms of the statement which occur frequently in all Professor Hodgson's writings.

Greek philosophical doctrine in the teeth of the contrary evidence of the Bible.

But these explanations clearly do not put paid to all questions. It still remains to ask, for example, in what sense we are to understand the statement that God the Son Himself became man. In what terms are we to think of this process of 'becoming'? Of the process itself Professor Hodgson has very little to say. He scarcely goes beyond offering the analogy of a son who leaves the circle of his family to go abroad; while he is away he keeps up his essential relations with the rest of his family, though inevitably during the separation they are exercised under different conditions. The very proportions of this analogy may be significant; what seems to interest Professor Hodgson is not the actual process of going away but the mode in which the relationships are carried on during the absence. It is as if he feels that, to be true to the New Testament emphasis, our chief concern must be not with the ultimately mysterious process by which the Son *became* man, but rather with what it meant for Him to *be* man.

On the latter question he has a number of things to say. As we have seen, the Christ of the New Testament is a completely human figure, and that means, as Professor Hodgson sees, that His relation to God in the days of His flesh must have been mediated, as other men's is, through the activity of the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and meditation. It was through such means, in principle quite intelligible to us, that Jesus came to realize His unique relation to God and His status and task as God's Messiah. But when this has been said, we have to recognize a clear difference; for to men, even the holiest of them, full communion with God comes, if at all, only after repentance and conversion from sin and, very often, renunciation of the world and its temptations; and even then it is, alas, never coterminous with the whole of life. Here Jesus was quite different; throughout His life His mind was always at home 'in the heavenly place' and it was from thence that He always looked out upon life. His question: 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' was 'a question expecting the answer "none"' as the whole synoptic tradition shows. We are bound to see that His freedom from sin was His by nature, not by acquisition; He was naturally, or by nature, what we at best hope to become by grace.

That is part of what it meant for the Son of God to be man, and we get further insight if we consider the age-old question of Christ's knowledge and ignorance. Here Professor Hodgson invokes the distinction between universals and particulars; it is of the essence of humanity, he argues, that universal truths should always be known to it in particular instances, and that every particular is for it a particular instance of some universal. So far as particulars went, Christ's knowledge was simply that possible to a human being of His time and place; but because of His unbroken communion with the Father He looked out upon these particulars, as they came His way, with the mind and outlook of God. Consequently He revealed God by His dealings with the particulars He came across, by the universals under which He brought them and the attitudes in which He dealt with them in practice.

Here again we get some inkling of what it means to say that He who was fully human was also Divine. What remains to be asked is whether Christ's divinity as so understood was adequate to the work of our salvation; for the acid test of any Christology is whether it forms the natural basis for a satisfactory doctrine of salvation. In Professor Hodgson's thought the transition is in part effected by way of a rather special theory of wrongdoing and punishment, derived ultimately from Bosanquet. Briefly the conclusion is that if men are to have hope in the face of their sin, it can only be based on a twofold conception of God as one who, being holy, repudiates the sinful acts of His creatures and, being love, absorbs the damage they do in such a way as to draw their sting. The way in which a human community repudiates evil is by inflicting appropriate pain on its wrongdoing members—that, in Professor Hodgson's view, is the essence and point of punishment. We may think of God in an analogous way. In the pain and suffering which Christ endured we see the Divine repudiation of sin; in the manner in which He endured it ('Father, forgive them') we see the absorption of its power for evil and the drawing of its sting. Even so brief a survey may serve to show how naturally Professor Hodgson's view of the Person of Christ might lead on to a profound doctrine of His saving work.

When it comes to summing up, the merits of Professor Hodgson's view are too obvious to need lengthy discussion. We may notice especially the determination to be faithful to the Biblical revelation at all points, the way the deity and humanity of Christ are both understood in their plain and full senses and also—a great virtue, as we have seen, in any Christology—the way the understanding of the Person of Christ leads on naturally to the understanding of His saving work. Before concluding we can hardly avoid asking what, if anything, there is to be said on the other side. In so short an article it would be impossible, even were the writer competent, to attempt any comprehensive appraisal; we shall limit ourselves to indicating two lines along which it seems possible that Professor Hodgson's theory may be criticized.

The first criticism would be radical inasmuch as

it would be concerned with Professor Hodgson's method and its underlying presupposition that 'the revelation was given, not in propositions but in a person.' Few theologians would deny the value of that statement as a corrective of the older, purely propositional, view. But many would feel that by itself it is no more than a half-truth. For, if it is true that the revelation is in a person, it is also true that the person is in the propositions. Whatever may have been the case with the earliest disciples, *we* cannot know the person apart from the propositions. For that reason many would accord the propositions themselves, and the descriptions and images they enshrine, a greater reverence than Professor Hodgson sometimes seems to do. There are two issues here. First the theological question of the status of the propositions in the process of revelation; some would hold that the propositions themselves are part of the process of revelation. The revelation is not just in the person, but in the person *as set forth in that particular language and imagery*, and in appropriating the revelation we are not meant to 'go behind' that language and substitute some other, more congenial, language for it. And then there is the more empirical question, raised by modern gospel criticism, whether we can in fact get behind the New Testament accounts, even if we wish to do so; and, if so, by what procedure. These are large questions which clearly cannot be entered upon here, but their relevance to Professor Hodgson's book must be briefly explained. Professor Hodgson builds everything on the New Testament picture of Christ, pressing it sometimes even in detail. But the picture as he uses it is seen through modern eyes and largely expressed in modern terms. Professor Hodgson often 'goes behind' the Biblical presentation as it stands to the 'real truth' which it enshrines. What of this 'going behind'? What are its motives and criteria? Occasionally they may seem to a student young enough to have been 'brought up' on form criticism to smack a little of the rationalism of late nineteenth-century criticism. For example, the idea of the Holy Spirit as the mediator of Christ's communion with the Father, on which Professor Hodgson builds so much, plays very little part in the Synoptic Gospels, as Professor Hodgson himself admits; and even that is a part about which form criticism would have much to say. Is Professor Hodgson right, then, in feeling convinced, as he says he does, that the few references there are 'are to be regarded as of great significance'? This point might be extended to other fields. Professor Hodgson starts, as we saw, from a description of Christ, as 'One who sought to find and do the Father's will in the power of the Spirit.' Is this really an adequate summary of what St. Mark, for example, sought to convey? It is perhaps noteworthy that the Old Testament imagery which modern criticism is finding more and more in the New Testament picture of Christ is almost wholly absent from the picture on which Professor Hodgson's view is based.

The other line of criticism would be quite different. It would be concerned with metaphysical questions. On these Professor Hodgson's position is clearly stated. Philosophy, he says, has no business to quarrel with empirical facts; its task is to accept the data of experience and to try to make sense of them in terms of a comprehensive rational system. For the Christian, one of the data is that God became flesh in Jesus Christ. Philosophy must accept this and do the best it can with it. It must see to it that the system it offers can assimilate this datum, and indeed give it pride of place as the key datum for the interpretation of all other data. This is well said, but is it the whole of the story? The Christian datum, however stated, involves the use of words in a highly symbolic or analogical way which itself raises considerable philosophical problems. To take one example, Professor Hodgson says that the word 'person' as applied to the persons of the Trinity must be given the full sense it has in modern parlance. But in modern parlance the word is defined relatively to beings in space and time. As God is not spatio-temporal the word as applied to Him must have an essentially different meaning. Nor is this irrelevant to Professor Hodgson's Christology, for the essence of his Christology, as we have seen, is that a person in the Divine sense lived as a person in the human sense. It is true that in his discussion of impassibility Professor Hodgson recognizes the existence of a problem here, but he says he has no solution of it to offer. This admission may now look more important than it seemed at first, for if Professor Hodgson has no account to give of what it *means* metaphysically for a Divine person to become human, his account must in the end be a piece of mythology, which poses the problem rather than offering a solution of it. What critics of this second sort would fear is that because this radical difference between the two uses of the word 'person'—and the same goes for other words—is not emphasized in the book, readers might mistake for a theory of the Incarnation what is in fact only a valuable statement of the problem.

Perhaps ultimately no theory can ever hope to be more, and lest he should seem to end on an ungrateful note, the writer would like to add a final expression of gratitude for the great profit he has gained from re-reading these works of Professor Hodgson for the purpose of writing this article.

Literature

CHRISTIAN BELIEF TO-DAY

Christian Belief To-day (Mowbray ; 15s. net) is one more sign, if further illustration be needed, of the growing recognition of the need for instruction in Christian doctrine. Edited by Dr. J. W. C. Wand, the Bishop of London, who writes the first group of five lectures on ' The Scheme of Salvation,' the book contains other groups of five lectures each, by Dr. W. R. Matthews, the Dean of St. Paul's on ' Problems of Christian Belief,' by Dr. V. A. Demant, Canon of Christ Church, on ' Man and the Social Order,' and by the Rev. Lindsay Dewar, B.D., Principal of Bishops' College, Cheshunt, and Canon of St. Albans, on ' Personality and Human Relations.' These twenty lectures, which undoubtedly must have aroused considerable interest, were given in the first place in the School of Religion conducted in the Diocese of London during Lent in 1952. All the lectures are stimulating, but special interest belongs to those of Dr. Matthews. Among other opinions which provoke thought is his conviction of a profound reality behind the doctrine of the Fall and its cosmic results. ' When I consider the panorama of life,' he writes, ' with all its strange and sometimes horrifying expressions, when I consider, for example, the life-histories of parasites, I have the overwhelming impression that something has gone wrong with the creation, and not only with the human race ; there is something demonic about the inexhaustible flood of life as well as something divine.' Canon Demant makes a welcome and much-needed emphasis in these days on the importance of the individual, and discusses with much insight such important themes as Human Rights and Political Responsibility. The psychological approach to modern problems of belief is made by Canon Dewar, who treats the Psychology of the Individual, the Two Sexes, Right and Wrong, the Christian Standard, and Personal Problems and their Solution. Among other challenging opinions he effectively maintains that divorce is no remedy for the difficulties which arise between the sexes. He goes so far as to say, ' If divorce were abolished to-morrow, although there would be many hard cases, I venture to think that the whole relationship between the sexes would be lifted on to a higher and happier plane.' Manifestly, the volume contains important discussions, and we can understand the Bishop of London's confession concerning the addresses of his colleagues, as read in the proofs, ' I must say that I have been much stirred by the perusal.' A deeper level is reached by Dr. Wand himself in his treatment of God's Pursuit of Man, the Redemption of Man, the Holy Spirit in Church and Sacraments and Eternal Life.

VINCENT TAYLOR

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE

Among our New Testament scholars none has been more prolific of literary progeny than Professor E. F. Scott. It is close on fifty years now since his famous volume on the Fourth Gospel caused a great flutter in the conservative dovecots and charmed everybody by its literary grace. Since that time book after book—commentaries, introductions, treatises on New Testament ethics and theology—have flowed from his pen, so that he must rank now as the doyen among English-speaking *Neutestamentlers*. Though he is long retired from his Chair, Dr. Scott believes it is better to ' wear out than to rust out ' and his pen is still active. His latest book, *The Crisis in the Life of Jesus* (Scribners' ; 12s. 6d. net), exhibits all the gifts of the old master, his admirable lucidity, his independence of other authorities, his firmly held Liberalism.

The theme is the Cleansing of the Temple. In Dr. Scott's view we have missed to appraise this episode at its true importance in the life of Jesus. It was like Cæsar's crossing of the Rubicon. Marking a great decision, it is a key to the Ministry. More than any other incident, it reveals the nature of the forces which opposed Him, and at last compassed His death. As we study it, we see Jesus' attitude to the old religion, the aims of His mission, the causes of His condemnation. In the Cleansing we see Jesus throwing down the gage to His enemies, the chief priests, proclaiming the universalism of true religion, and, above all, asserting His Messiahship. The act is not out of character. If we have thought of Jesus only as a tender Shepherd, we have seen only one side of His nature. So far from being an ineffectual visionary, He was a strong, fearless leader, a man of action par excellence.

What one misses in the treatment is any sympathy with more recent gospel interpretation—the sense of an eschatological crisis, of the supernal Reign of God breaking into history in Jesus' mission and message, of the all-decisiveness for all time of the Person who is the central actor in the drama of Passion Week. This book might have

been written before Weiss and Schweitzer, before Otto and Dodd and Cullmann. It is the work of one who, in a generation which has rediscovered in the Gospels eschatology and even ecclesiology, remains a gifted but unrepentant Liberal.

A. M. Hunter

CHINA MISSIONS

A now familiar feature of the Communist Purge is that the accused plead guilty and demand the maximum penalty. Somewhat akin to this is a tendency among some missionaries expelled from China to assume that the debacle of Christian missions there is a judgment of God, and to confess, on behalf of their predecessors, sins which we did not commit. Has not the 'Cyrus-the-Lord's-anointed' attitude been over-done? It first came, unwelcome, to my notice, when a former China colleague wrote in such terms about the Japanese invasion of China in 1937. This savoured too much of Christian support for a policy of appeasement, and happily it was not taken up. Stalin's (or Mao's) claim to the Cyrus rôle, however, seems by now almost to be taken for granted. Yet so startling a statement required an Isaiah. Are our modern interpreters sure that they stand among the prophets? If they answer 'Yes,' I shall try to get in the charge of 'complacency' (blessed word!) before they make it.

These questions are raised by the very title of a book—*Christian Missions and the Judgment of God*, by David M. Paton (S.C.M.; 6s. 6d. net)—and raised more acutely by its second chapter. I cannot believe that we founded Christian schools 'to produce subordinate professional workers for the Church,' or gave a type of education pointing to social reform but 'reform in the interests of the West.' I know many Chinese Christians, Christian schools too, the opposite of 'notorious for their poor grasp of Chinese literature.' 'The dead doctrine of progress sustained our fathers in the carrying of capitalist democratic culture to most parts of the globe,' is a somewhat one-sided description of even our less enlightened spiritual ancestors. Is it fair to compare the abilities of Christian medical schools to send their graduates where they were needed most, with the power of direction of a police-state? And if we *had* half-trained Chinese doctors, but in greater numbers, might not the author have fixed his criticism on their half-training, 'subordinate workers' indeed? The complaint that 'the Church has been mainly among the poor and ignorant' sounds, if for one moment I may borrow the jargon, strangely bourgeois.

Having got this off my chest, let me add that these lectures by 'Bill' Paton's son are vigorous and provocative. The third, on 'Looking Ahead,' shows better judgment, as well as more measured expression of judgment, than the parts of the book which look back. This means that I agree with many of Mr. Paton's conclusions, though disagreeing with so much of the route by which he arrives at them. Each generation has its own setting of danger and of opportunity—our Victorian ancestors, we of the generation between the Wars, these of the strange new world. A new campaign needs fresh strategy, and here much that is wise is said.

There are misprints on pp. 18 and 29. 'The *workers* lose every battle but the last' is surely a misquotation (p. 29). It is sad to see a British publisher following the American way of massing footnotes at the end of a chapter instead of putting them where they belong.

John Foster

A GUIDE TO CHRISTIAN READING?

A curious book has been issued to give guidance to 'evangelical workers' in Christian reading, under the title *A Guide to Christian Reading* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 5s. net). In the Introduction it is recognized that these workers have 'a more urgent need than ever for up-to-date and scholarly literature.' They are offered a selected bibliography on the Bible, Theology, Apologetics, the Practice of Christianity, Church History, and Missions, which includes many books which can scarcely be described as either scholarly or up-to-date, and which omits many of the most important works of the last half-century.

It is hard to detect any principle which governs the inclusions and omissions. The dominant concern would seem to be to protect conservatives from ever having to think for themselves by being exposed to any other than their own ideas. Yet the compilers have occasionally included works which rest on the abhorred critical principles, with an appeal to their readers to exercise discrimination. Many volumes of the 'Expositors' Bible' are included but Marcus Dods' 'Genesis' is not thought worthy of inclusion. George Adam Smith is held safe for conservatives, but Skinner's 'Prophecy and Religion' is not. C. H. Dodd is occasionally given a pass mark, but T. W. Manson and William Manson never. For the background of the New Testament Schürer is allowed, but conservatives are not recommended to read Moore's 'Judaism.' Burney's 'Judges' may be read without danger, but nothing by Wheeler Robinson or by T. H. Robinson. Some volumes of the Cambridge Bible are permitted, but nothing by S. R. Driver. Even his commentary on 'Daniel' is excluded, though it offers more factual informa-

tion to any reader than all the books on Daniel recommended. In view of the generally one-sided nature of the selection it is perhaps most surprising that Foakes-Jackson and Lake's 'Beginnings of Christianity' is recommended.

It would seem to the reviewer that either some of these books should have been excluded as dangerous to the tender plants that conservatives are apparently thought to be, or a great many works no more liberal than these, and far more scholarly, up-to-date, and authoritative than large numbers that have been included, should have found a place. By no stretch can this bibliography be said to be representative of present-day scholarship; yet neither is it wholly safe for the timid. The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, which issues this book, includes many good scholars whom the reviewer holds in high esteem. He finds it hard to believe that this volume represents the best scholarship that Fellowship commands.

A few errors have been noted. Welch's 'Code of Deuteronomy' was not published by Manchester University Press (p. 37), and the reviser of Gesenius's 'Hebrew Grammar' was Kautzsch, not Kantzoch (p. 25). H. H. Rowley

---

SIR JAMES BAILLIE

Reflections on Life and Religion by Sir James Baillie, O.B.E., D.Phil., LL.D., edited by Sir Walter Moberly and Professor Oliver de Selincourt (Allen and Unwin; 16s. net). The distinguished editors of this volume of selections from the commonplace-book of the late Sir James Baillie have deserved well of the public in producing it. The extracts cover a period of forty-seven years, and the editors have come as near to unification as is possible in the circumstances. Its value, of course, lies in its variety, and it is a book to which one will return again and again, and always with delight and profit.

Sir James Baillie was a philosopher who became an administrator without neglecting his philosophy, although in his later years he was considerably detached from his earlier Hegelian devotion and more than doubtful of the intrinsic value of metaphysics, especially in its application to religion. With growing vehemence he opposed the idea that religion was merely bad or imperfect philosophy. Characteristic dicta in this connexion are 'A man who lives inside a system has locked the door of his intelligence,' and, again, 'Metaphysics is a method of watering the capital of human knowledge.' In his conception of religion Sir James emphasizes repeatedly the 'intrusion' of God into human experience and in one or two passages he approaches very nearly to the theology of crisis. He raises, however, our conception of providence to a higher level than ordinary by pointing out that it is concerned with the small things of life in their cumulative effect rather than with the larger issues, and his idea of the continual presence of the sacramental in life and religion is outstandingly beautiful. As regards immortality he is at first hesitating and then confident, and his attitude to historicity in religion seems to begin in negation but later passes into whole-hearted acceptance. The same line of development may be traced in his doctrine of the miraculous and his belief in the Resurrection. One feels that in its conclusion of the whole matter this book reaches a type of faith which should satisfy the most earnest Christian in matters of highest importance, and of nothing does the author seem more sure than that morality without religion is valueless; 'it is,' as he says, 'like trying to encourage a brave army to venture on a campaign without a general.' The major part of the book is concerned with religion, and most seriously, but amongst the multitude of epigrammatic sayings which would illumine both life and conversation if only they could be remembered at the appropriate moment, there are some in lighter vein which would intrigue rather than irritate even those on whom at first sight they might seem to bear most devastatingly.

W. S. Urquhart

A LITTLE-KNOWN REFORMER

An important supplement to recent studies of the English Protestant tradition has appeared in *Thomas Becon and the Reformation of the Church in England*, by Mr. Derrick Sherwin Bailey, Ph.D. (Oliver and Boyd; 15s. net). Like so many of the English reformers Becon was a Cambridge man, but, unlike not a few of these, though he had been chaplain to the Protector Somerset and to Archbishop Cranmer and though he was imprisoned when Mary came to the throne, he managed to make his way to the Continent and returned to become a Canon of Canterbury under the Elizabethan regime. He might have expected preferment to a higher position; and perhaps his being passed over was not unconnected with his having, in Queen Mary's time, joined in the attack on what Knox called 'the monstruous regiment of women.'

Undistinguished as a theologian, Becon excelled as a Protestant propagandist, as a preacher and a writer of tracts and pamphlets, which, because they were so powerful in their own day, have fallen into oblivion ever since.

Dr. Bailey corrects some errors and misunderstandings on the part of previous writers who have mentioned this reformer, and, in view of the fact that little is known of certain periods of his career, he gives plausible reasons for the view that Becon

was then engaged in more or less 'underground' work in the reforming interest.

This book is clear in writing and orderly in presentation, and, with its notes, bibliographies, and index, is a work of real scholarship. Dr. Bailey deserves thanks for rescuing from neglect a figure of real consequence, whose writings are a mine of information about social and economic conditions at the time, and in whose personality and career the course and character of the English Reformation are mirrored. STEWART MECHIE

ST. MATTHEW

The latest addition to 'The Torch Bible Commentaries'—*The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, by the Rev. G. E. P. Cox (S.C.M.; 9s. net)—will further enhance the reputation of the series. The general reader will find here lucid writing, careful planning, and informative exposition. The book consists of a brief but pointed introduction succeeded by a compact and interesting commentary that finds room for several useful detached notes.

The Introduction contains good material on oral tradition, Q, and the *raison d'être* of the Gospels before dealing particularly with Matthew. The writer holds that the first evangelist set out to supply the deficiencies in Mark, *i.e.*, to account adequately for the origin of Christ and to provide the Christian community with a substantial corpus of Dominical ethical didache. Mr. Cox rightly suggests that the use of testimonia is detectable in the Matthæan Birth narratives, but surely his implicit claim (p. 25) that Matthew invariably quotes from the Greek Bible is questionable. Sometimes Matthew appears to be using the Hebrew text though perhaps mediated through a lost Book of Testimonies. Again, the commentator does not commit himself on the issue of whether the special Matthæan source M was documentary in character. No one would object to his reluctance to dogmatize on so nebulous a problem, but some may regret his omission to note with Streeter the possible, and, indeed, probable, common ground shared by M and the Matthæan Birth narratives. When one recalls that in some respects Matthew's unique material approaches an Apocryphal position then one suspects that Mr. Cox's treatment of the Virgin Birth might have been handled differently had he viewed M and the Birth narratives together.

On the subject of authorship the writer does not allow his judgment to be clouded by Papias' puzzling statement and maintains inevitably that there can be no certainty. Likewise he leaves the place of origin an open question. A date between A.D. 90 and 100 is favoured. Perhaps these termini could be lowered a little.

For exegetical purposes Mr. Cox divides the Gospel into a Prologue containing the story of the birth and training of Jesus, the Five Books of Matthew containing Dominical didache on different themes, and an Epilogue containing the Passion and Resurrection material. This fivefold division of the Gospel is, of course, very ancient. Papias adopted it when he wrote the first commentary on Matthew, and the fragment that possibly comes from Melito of Sardis shows that in the second century the underlying plan of Matthew's Gospel was well known. There can be no doubt, as Mr. Cox observes, that Matthew took as his type the Mosaic Pentateuch and strove to present its evangelical fulfilment.

Using this plan Mr. Cox gives a very sound and illuminating exegesis marked by an absence of fevered fancy or strong personal predisposition. Always he is calm, fair, and cautious—sometimes fastidiously so. This is why his very virtues occasionally betray him. It is proper that a book should receive an 'even' discussion throughout—but only if it is an 'even' book, and Matthew is not. For the general reader, for instance, the Sermon on the Mount is the outstanding section of Matthew. The enigmatic fascination of the Sermon demands some broad statement on how the Sermon as a whole is to be interpreted. The reader wants to know, for example, if he has merely to do with an interim ethic. Mr. Cox does not devote himself sufficiently to such large and weighty questions. Sometimes, perhaps, even his particular exegesis of a key-word is inadequate, for example, 'righteousness' in 5^6.

Further, his treatment of the notorious section 16^{16-20} is unnecessarily naïve even in a popular commentary, and not everyone will agree with his verdict that 'there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the passage as part of the original text of Matthew's Gospel' (p. 112). What may apply to *v.* 17 or indeed 18 does not *ipso facto* apply to 19.

The special notes included in the exegesis add much to the worth of this book, but when writing on the Virgin Birth Mr. Cox comes perilously near to circularity in his argument and his concluding statement (p. 34) will appear to some as a *non sequitur*.

These strictures, some of them of a specialized type, must not, however, detract from the general excellence of this book. It is well done and one of the best short commentaries available for the general reader. It would be lamentable if the pulings of a critic were to obscure that.

A. C. KING

The late Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé was a cosmopolitan in the fullest sense of the term, and

it is difficult to say whether he belongs most closely to Germany, Britain, America, or South Africa. The width of his professional experience is reflected in the unprejudiced character of the writings which are included in this posthumous volume—*Studies in Philosophy*, edited with Memoir by Mr. Daniel S. Robinson (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net). The Memoir discusses interestingly his relation to other philosophers, especially Royce and Bosanquet. Some of the articles are here published for the first time, and others are reprints, the latter being on the whole of higher quality. He had an original as well as an analytic mind, but was not a system-maker.

One of the best chapters in the first part is on 'The Theory of Knowledge,' and he is almost able to explain what is meant by this. In another essay he emphasizes the contribution which religious experience can make to an objective belief in God, expanding the general principle that Value-judgments are reality-revealing much more so than the bare data of sense perception. In his brilliant comparison of the 'correspondence' and 'coherence' theories of truth he shows that the two are inextricably intertwined, and his cosmopolitan experience and linguistic facility reveal themselves in the contention that, if we are to understand the various philosophic theories of mind, we should first of all have to learn the philosophic language of each philosopher.

Religion in Human Experience (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net) is an immense subject, and Mr. John R. Everett finds it so. He begins with a discussion on What Religion is. But, in the main, he concentrates on Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, and Christianity. Muhammadanism, in spite of its place in the world's life and thought, gets only a few pages, Mahavira some five, and Shintoism about ten. Zoroaster is pretty well ignored.

But there is a heap of reading in the book. An interesting chapter is the last—'Religion in the Modern World'—in which many facts are treated with discernment.

One of the 'grand old men' still spared to us is Dr. L. P. Jacks, who for so long maintained 'The Hibbert Journal' at so uniformly high a level. When he was eighty years of age he gave us a fascinating autobiography. Now when he is ninety-three he puts us further in his debt with a book entitled *Near the Brink* (Allen and Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). His 'observations' are classified in two parts, first 'Of Things That Matter Most,' second 'Of Things That Matter Greatly.' In the former we have his thoughts on life and death, and on the need for giving Beauty its rightful place alongside Truth and Goodness, the undying hope for a world community, his debt to Loisy. In the latter we get mainly his views on War and Peace. The vigour of his thought is amazing and his literary style has lost none of the old familiar graces. If one finds, for example, his argument on Immortality a little difficult, on every page one will find oneself braced and stimulated. His facility and felicity in citing Scripture are very striking.

The Rev. Clarence Tucker Craig must be listened to with great respect when he speaks of the Ecumenical Movement, for he has played a noble part in advancing it. He now gives us *The One Church in the Light of the New Testament* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net). It is written with clarity and candour. One has not read quite so candid exposition of the difficulties which confront the Faith and Order Commission as we find here. The author is quite enthusiastic yet one gets the impression that he has little hope of agreement within measurable time. He reminds us that if progress towards unity has been made in recent times, there has also been retrogression. He fears that even if the One Church should be set up there is no guarantee against subsequent secession. He reminds us—we in Scotland are painfully aware of it—that accomplished church unions have usually left a minority continuing their separate existence. So a 'United Church of Christ' might conceivably be just another denomination. On the positive side he declares that he is speaking only for himself. With much of what he says there will be widespread agreement. For example, in the re-united Church there must be no compulsion or repression of individual conscience. The defects of his view seem to be any real answer to the questions What authority will the Church have and how and by whom will it be exercised? He envisages, as Andrew Melville did, a hierarchy of Church Councils but what precisely are to be the executive powers, if any, of the Supreme Council is left very vague. As to light from the New Testament one feels that in reality the author has not found a great deal and with some of his findings, for example his depreciation of the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, certainly there will be difference of opinion. But it is a worth-while book by a man who is earnest and sincere if not always equally convincing.

One feels a twinge of prejudice on reading a book on the Keswick Movement by a writer who has never been in this country, not to speak of attending the Keswick Convention itself. The personal touch, the glow of personal experience are lacking. Yet despite that great disadvantage which one thinks could surely have been escaped the Rev.

Steven Barabas, B.A., Th.D., who teaches in Wheaton College, has by sheer research given a very full and reliable account of the history and message of Keswick in a book entitled *So Great Salvation* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 17s. 6d. net).

The grammar is once or twice a little shaky, but the writing is lucid and interesting, and the book is the most complete account available of the Movement to which so many have owed so much.

The last section gives brief biographical sketches of some of the outstanding leaders. Our Scottish denominational divisions have been a little too much for Dr. Barabas so that the names of the ministerial charges held by G. H. C. Macgregor (p. 162) and J. Elder Cumming (p. 163) are incorrectly given.

This symposium—*The Faith : A Symposium of Bible Doctrine*, edited by Dr. Frederick A. Tatford (Pickering and Inglis; 18s. 6d. net)—is a mingling of old-fashioned orthodoxy and moderate modernity. The essays are of unequal merit. Some of them reveal the best spirit and truth of purely traditional belief. The discussion, for example, of Universal Fatherhood is well balanced, but the attempt to adjust Divine Sovereignty and human freedom does not help very much in the solution of pressing problems. The account of Creation is simple and beautiful, and, while seemingly accepting many of the findings of science, takes the line that these are all anticipated in the Genesis account—a method which does not yield the deepest appreciation of the Scriptural record. The chapters on the questions of a Personal Devil, the Second Coming, and the Last Things are hardly up to the standard of the rest of the book. In general, one may grant most of the assumptions in the book, but question whether they are used in a way likely to convince those not previously conditioned towards acceptance of them. The appendix on the history of the canon is one of the most informative parts of the book.

In a little book, *Worshipping and Serving* (Pickering and Inglis; 6s. 6d. net), the Rev. R. J. Smithson, B.Th., Ph.D., presents twenty-three devotional and practical meditations. They are all short and all pointed and well illustrated. Further, the book contains a number of pleasing photographic views, each of which has a message of its own for a meditative eye.

No one interested in or concerned with the rise of the Roman See to supremacy in the first five Christian centuries can afford to neglect *Documents Illustrating Papal Authority A.D. 96–454*, edited and introduced by Mr. E. Giles (S.P.C.K.; 17s. 6d. net). Many have undertaken to amass what evidence exists in the writings of the Fathers or Synodical and Conciliar Decrees as to the place either assigned to or claimed by Roman Bishops. This work, however, excels its prototypes in fullness and at least approximate completeness. Controversialists have sometimes given a false picture by isolating too short a passage from its context. Our author avoids that. He gives a translation of the whole relevant passage. In very useful notes he handles passages that have been variously interpreted, and tries to show how the historical background of a particular writer must be considered in estimating the real significance of what he says.

The S.C.M. Press deserves credit for publishing the two Reports so far presented by the Church of Scotland Commission on Communism—*The Challenge of Communism* (4s. net) and *The Church under Communism* (5s. net). The scope of the two books is fairly well indicated by their titles. It only remains for a reviewer to mention the comprehensive view, the factual information, the vigorous thought and the balanced judgment made manifest in them both, and to express the wish that the publishers may find it possible, through large sales of the present edition, to produce another cheaper edition, so that Christians far and near may have no excuse for remaining uninformed about the vital issues which Communism presents.

From the S.C.M. come two booklets which will prove very useful to all interested in the recent Conference at Lund. One is *Faith and Order*, The Report of the Third World Conference at Lund, Sweden, 15th to 28th August, 1952 (3s. 6d. net). The other is *Lund, 1952*, an Account of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, and has been written by the Assistant Head of Religious Broadcasting, Mr. E. H. Robertson (3s. 6d. net). Mr. Robertson has done his work exceedingly well. By his judicious citations from the speeches made by outstanding personalities he gives a vivid and a balanced transcription of day-by-day events. It is well-known that at Lund no sensational progress was reported, the familiar snags to union of Christians are still there. Yet both the booklets have their encouraging side. If union remains far off there is yet a deepened, or shall one say heightened, realization of fundamental unity. Very much to the point is the 'Word to the Churches' (p. 5 of the 'Report'), 'We would therefore earnestly request our Churches to consider whether they are doing all they ought to do to manifest the oneness of the people of God.' We could all think of churches that seem to be doing precisely nothing along that line.

Jesus' Own Thoughts About His Death

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Glasgow

Jesus' thought about His death must have been imposed upon the background of His attitude to the general and inevitable fact of human mortality. Unless we imagine His life to have been a pre-arranged programme we have to take seriously the idea that 'He learned obedience,' and that His thoughts grew and deepened through life's experience, and we have to remember that one early and universal part of human experience is the knowledge that death has to be faced at the end. Apart from any preoccupation with the manner or meaning of His own death Jesus lived like all men with the knowledge that man is mortal.

Men vary greatly in their attitude to this fact. Principal Denney spoke with intense personal revulsion of the corruption of the tomb. Others try to repudiate this aspect of death; like Meredith, who says,

> Into the breast that gives the rose,
> Shall I with shuddering fall?

And there are those to whom it just does not seem to occur. Ought men to be preoccupied with the idea of death? Or should the fact that death lies in wait be largely ignored?

What was the mind of Christ? At different places Jesus is reported as commending the life that in this regard is carefree—'which of you by taking thought can add to his age one cubit' (Mt 6^{27}). 'Take no thought for the morrow' (Mt 6^{34}). 'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father. . . . Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows' (Mt 10^{29}). He said of Jairus' daughter, she 'is not dead, but sleepeth' (Mt 9^{24}). A man is cheerfully to sit loose to life—'Whosoever will save his life shall lose it' (Mt 16^{25}). 'Go ye, and tell that fox [Herod]' (Lk 13^{32}) is His scornful answer to a threat. The path of duty is a safe path. 'Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not' (Jn 11^{9}). So in the end He dies with the simple words on His lips, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Lk 23^{46}). And in all this it is to be emphasized that this attitude is sustained not by indifference or stoicism but by a lively faith in God.

This confident temper, however, has to be chastened by the thought of judgment. 'Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. . . . Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell' (Lk 12^{4}). It is the meek who shall inherit 'the better land' (Mt 5^{5}), the righteous who shall then shine forth as the sun (Mt 13^{43}). But Jesus nowhere takes over the Old Testament idea that death is the punishment of sin. For Him it is an incident in man's earthly existence, part, like marriage, of the lower imperfect order of things which will pass away (Lk 20^{36}). To quote E. F. Scott ('Death' in Hastings' *D.C.G.*, i. 428): 'Destruction is in store for *all* sinners; and the punishment cannot therefore consist in death by violence, which falls on few. Much less can it consist in natural death, from which the good can escape no more than the wicked.' Accidents like that at the tower of Siloam are not judgments (Lk 13^{4}). But judgment will be no accident. Repent ye therefore, or ye shall too likewise perish. 'Be ye also ready' (Mt 22^{44}), 'Watch' (Mk 13^{37}).

Thus for Jesus immortality was an assured fact. For a good conscience death has no terrors, and even violent and painful death is to be faced with the carelessness we call heroic. It is to this outlook that He returned in His dying words. It characterizes also references to His death that He made in the course of His ministry. It is against the background of this general outlook that the agony of His Passion has to be regarded.

In saying this the view is rejected that Jesus from the beginning of His ministry foresaw His doom. The account of the early Galilean ministry makes that idea impossible, for the hopeful note Jesus sounded then cannot be regarded as an affectation.

Denney, it is true, objects that this line of thought involves an *a priori* insistence that ordinary historical criteria are valid in respect of Jesus. He does not seem to realize that it is not historical but psychological criteria that are used. The total impression of Jesus rules out any interpretation of the Galilean ministry that does not regard it as sincerely hopeful.

Further, the idea that from the outset of His ministry Jesus was facing the prospect of its being fulfilled in personal agony does not really find the support that Denney and others would find for it in the narrative of His baptism, for which Jesus Himself must have been the source. There the

voice from heaven echoes familiar words of Scripture, first from a Psalm, 'Thou art my Son,' then from Is 42, 'My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' (Mk 1^{11}). This allusion to 'the servant of the Lord' they assume to cover all the Isaiah passages on this theme, especially the reference in Is 53 to sin-bearing.

Denney thus passes without notice the fact that the reference in Is 42 is not to the suffering but to the triumphant servant who shall not fail or be discouraged till he hath set judgment in the earth. The reference to sin-bearing is reached by collating Is 53, which according to the narrative Jesus did not do. This same point is made in Vincent Taylor's newly issued Commentary on Mark. The collation of the various 'servant' passages, which is so inevitable for a modern scholar, might very well not be matter of course to one making occasional use of sacred rolls. The attempt to prove from this narrative that Jesus undertook His mission with the whole tragic development of it in His knowledge therefore fails, for it first reads into the evidence what it afterwards extracts from it.

In the earlier period of His ministry the references Jesus made to His own death are few. There is the saying about the days when the bridegroom shall be taken away (Mk 2^{20}) which forecast some untoward ending of the happy fellowship existing. Then there are all the references to the fate of prophets. 'So persecuted they the prophets,' He says in the Beatitude (Mt 5^{12}). The Baptist was the last of this line (Mt 11^{13}). His reproach to the Jews is that they were guilty of 'the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world' (Lk 11^{50}). And there is the parable in which, after all the other messengers, the king's son is killed (Mk 12^{7}). These sayings indicate that He thought of death coming like the martyrdom of a prophet. And how do martyrs die? Sometimes by a sudden grim stroke; sometimes even joyously. Recent history has lengthened the starry list of those who have gone quietly, even gaily, into battle, counting that it would not matter in the day of victory though they fell. In one place at least Jesus is seen glancing at such a prospect without any thought that His dauntlessness was unique; when He says to the ambitious sons of Zebedee, 'Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized' (Mk 10^{39}).

Further there are the three successive places (Mk 8^{31} 9^{31} 10^{33}) where Jesus to their bewilderment spoke to His disciples of certain doom. Undoubtedly Jesus there shows a new preoccupation with His death. But it is to be noted that the last of these incidents is immediately followed by that reply to James and John just cited, that they would share His cup and baptism. One cannot therefore believe that these three references to His death amounted to a realization of the spiritual horror that it was to be, an agony which none could share.

This is confirmed by the 'ransom' saying which follows, which is no Pauline insertion, but the genuine germ of a Pauline development. 'Ransom' is here used as a crowning instance of ministry or service done to others. Rashdall finds in it, 'the simple doctrine that His death like His life was a piece of service or self-sacrifice for His followers such as they themselves might very well make for one another.' One may, indeed, count Rashdall reckless in saying that this is the only doctrine of the Atonement which can be traced to Jesus Himself. But one may accept his exegesis of the 'ransom' text in its context and hold that here, too, Jesus' outlook on death in general colours His thought of His own death. However inevitable, it is to be an incident in the victory on which His hope is set. This hope thrusts the fear of death aside. Such hope is not calculation, it is one of a spiritual Trinity—faith, hope, and charity. There was hope not quite quenched in Jesus' entry into the city as its King, and in His daily preaching in the Temple. There was indomitable confidence in His reply to the High Priest's question, 'Art thou the Christ?' 'I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power' (Mk 14^{62}). There was gallant disregard of self when on the way to Calvary He said 'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me' (Lk 23^{28}). And in serene confidence He breathed His last, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Lk 23^{46}).

Jesus' words at the Last Supper have also to be noted at this point, because they were spoken in a mood of serene self-mastery, showing no trace of the perturbation that came at Gethsemane and Calvary. Jesus made that final evening a time of quiet gracious fellowship. To the sadness of impending separation He united the expectation of a consummation and reunion. His death was for them. He offered His example of humble service. He asked them to pledge their loyalty. And the feast ended with a hymn. There is nothing here to throw any light upon the agitation and agony that was to follow. He was still facing His approaching death for others with the undisturbed faith of His general attitude to death. For this reason it is premature to look to these words for the deepest meaning of Jesus' death.

Thus far our survey makes a picture of the mind of Jesus totally different from the shrinking agony of Gethsemane and the shuddering despair ringing in the cry of dereliction on the Cross. This discrepancy must now be pondered. The study of

Jesus' own thoughts about His death must set this contradiction in high relief and ask how it was that death itself was spoilt for Him and to one who had spoken of it with fearlessness became a soul-shaking horror. The question, Why did Jesus die? which D. M. Baillie uses as a title to one chapter of his book, *God Was In Christ*, may sound inept; for naturally, if He was born, He had to die. The question Why did Jesus die then and there in that particular course of events? is a historical question of profound interest and importance. But the real religious interest is in the psychological question, Why did Jesus die *thus*? Baillie, indeed himself, says, 'that when we speak of the Passion of Jesus we are speaking chiefly of the spiritual agony of the whole situation.'[1]

One answer that suggests itself must be put aside as quite insufficient, namely, that as the hour of suffering approached the fear of it grew. Doubtless that was true. Nevertheless a generation that has known so many men, without fuss, accept in the way of duty or service the coming of horrible suffering and death, cannot find in the approach of physical anguish the key to the last agony of our Lord.

It is, therefore, clear that some other element in His doom constituted its horror for Jesus. And the evidence is that this horror grew upon Him even before His enemies laid hands on Him. The hour came when He began to be bewildered and appalled, and said plainly to His three closest disciples 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death' (Mk 14^{34}). The prayer in the Garden shows too that the agony was not only the misery of that hour but was also an anticipation of some further aggravation of darkness and desolation that He would encounter.

Have we the means or the right to explore this psychological mystery? Here what most of all arrests attention is not that Jesus died, or even that He died by cruel violence, but that His dying was a spiritual agony. Without some insight into why this was so, we have not made contact with the whole reality of His death. What, then, were the factors that made His death to Jesus a horror of great darkness?

One factor must have been Jesus' realization of the personal rôle He had in the movement He served. He had begun simply with the message of the Kingdom. And John's reference to Another yet to come was dropped. There was no need to wait for the future and for some one else, the Kingdom was here. But more and more it grew evident that it was in His company that the Kingdom was realized. He healed, He converted sinners from their ways. He was not only proclaiming but personally inaugurating the Kingdom of God. What gave Him this personal rôle? Was it not that since His nation was refusing to be drawn into the missionary rôle of suffering servant and meet the Roman tyranny not by hatred and revolt but by submission and spiritual appeal He would do this Himself, and thus in His own Person fulfil through suffering the religious mission of His race? His function in the movement was to be more than leadership. Such thoughts He found confirmed as much as suggested by the references in Scripture to the Suffering Servant, the Messiah and the Son of man which He saw finding a new common focus in Himself as He pondered them and sought light from them on His path of duty. Such reflections pointed, however vaguely, to some intensely personal experience only to be viewed with apprehension. Jesus thus came to have, even if from the first He did not have, the conviction that it was His vocation to suffer in a unique way; and this is, of course, a large element in the interpretation of the Cross. Yet this factor in itself does not throw light on the sudden intensification of His spiritual passion at the end.

Another factor was surely that Jesus in those last days was facing more and more closely the fact of human sin. Probably our emphasis on the gracious burden of Jesus' preaching tends to make us notice too little His loathing of the depravities of human thought and conduct. Take His description of the hypocrites as 'whited sepulchres inwardly full of dead men's bones.' It has become a cold, classic literary cliché. But the emotional flavour of it is in a newspaper reference, that lies before me as I write, to two contemporary American politicians, 'an unsavoury couple . . . their smelly fame.' Or think of His words about one who wrongs little children. 'It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.'

Jesus whose moral judgment had this intense quality had now under His perceptive eye daily the maturing purpose of treachery in Judas. That would be one part of His agony in Gethsemane; and when He foresaw a still bitterer torment to come the gospel tradition is that one element in the anticipation of misery was that He discerned already the baseness that would make Peter deny Him.

Then as the proceedings of the arrest and trial and execution dragged on, one element after another of human iniquity pressed to His notice; the corruption of justice—bribery to secure Roman soldiers for policemen and to get Pilate to hold Court before dawn; the false witnesses; the clamorous preference for Barabbas; the inhumanity of executioners and spectators; the indifference of those who shared out His garments;

[1] *God Was in Christ*, 164.

the jeers of satisfied opponents. Everything was there to stir intensest detestation in His soul. The foulness in human nature and hideousness of men's ways lay exposed and was being brought home to Him. As Baillie says, 'it was the contemplation of that immense moral and spiritual tragedy that made the situation almost unbearably terrible to Jesus.'

Here, indeed, is one large factor in the suffering of Jesus and in the moral influence of the Cross over human hearts. Yet when every weight is given to it we are still left asking why, even in this experience, Jesus was not upborne by a sense of triumphant endurance, as indeed some of the victims of the worst atrocities of the Nazis say they were upborne. It was not as if the sense of triumph was far away. But it was submerged in Gethsemane, and again upon the Cross, when He cried out in despair.

Somehow the sin of man impinged upon the unbroken fellowship of Jesus with God. Professor J. A. Robertson has put it that He was so encompassed by men's sins that His consciousness of God faded out. But this is too vague. The mystery is suggested in Is 53, and is asserted to exist in Peter's words 'who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree' (1 P 2^{24}), and in Paul's, 'he hath made him to be sin for us' (2 Co 5^{21}). Much theological writing has concerned itself with attempts to explain the mystery by saying that in some way Jesus felt the guilt of humanity or offered whatever is signified by 'vicarious repentance.' It is doubtful if such statements can even be made in a really meaningful way, for they involve the transference of intimate psychological experiences from person to person like property conveyed by deed.

The clue that is still missing for insight into the last agony of Jesus must therefore lie in a further factor in His experience. All that men had done to Himself He had been able to endure with love. 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' (Lk 23^{34}). Yet stay! All this was sin against the Holy God. Had He a right to proclaim God's forgiveness of such things? Was His indomitable love for His brethren out of accord with the Divine righteousness? The Parable of the Wicked Husbandman (Mk 12^{1-4}) is evidence that the Godward aspect of sin was especially in His mind in connexion with His death. That was the very nadir of sin, the rejection of the Son Himself with all His claim to reverence. And the Divine reaction to this culminating sin is given in the Parable as judgment. 'He will miserably destroy those wicked men.' Jesus does not share the too common notion that sin is best described and realized by its social effects and that its theological orientation is unreal and abstract. For Him it was above all an affront offered to God. If He was forgiving such sin, was not His fellowship with the Father being broken? And with this question came the climax of His spiritual agony. The cry of dereliction, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Mk 15^{34}), seems to bear witness to an intolerable clash of thought and feeling that amounted to a sense of separation from the Father.

This might be objected to as an assertion that what was in Christ's mind was a bare logical dilemma. But that would overlook the fact that such logical dilemmas between love and justice have often been to the deepest natures among men like a rack on which they were torn, and the solution, if there was any, came not by reason but by personal faith and love. Speaking of a faith-shaking experience of his student days, the late Principal Cairns writes: 'I entered here a long dark tunnel of my life. My health gave way under the mental strain.' [1]

The only theologian I know who has given a clear and plain statement that here lies the kernel of Christ's suffering and the key to any comprehension of it is A. B. Macaulay in the chapter in his *The Death of Jesus* called 'The Ordeal of Jesus in His Death.' [2] There he brings into comparison Moses' cry: 'Forgive their sin . . .; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book' (Ex 32^{32}) and Paul's 'I could wish that myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake!' And he quotes Jonathan Edwards who said that Christ had 'a great and clear sight of the infinite wrath of God against the sins of man and the punishment that they deserved.' Then Macaulay says himself, 'So awful was the sight that it tried His assurance that His own mind towards man, expressed in His prayer of loving intercession, was the mind of the Father.'

The point has here to be pressed that such a doubt involved the whole truth of the gospel He had preached. It was not a new gospel. It was the purely spiritual and universal faith proclaimed by Jeremiah, that religion was the personal bond between the soul and God and that it was a new covenant of grace. The new covenant of which Jesus spoke at the Last Supper was an old thing, though now to be sealed and for ever to be associated with His death. Even to Jeremiah 'covenant' was an archaic term with suggestions of the Divine initiative in merciful dealing with His people. Jeremiah and later writers gave it a large and gracious sense covering forgiveness and righteousness and peace. It involved no technicality of ritual that might limit it to a nation or a sect, for it is written on the heart of the individual.

[1] *David Cairns*, 89 f.

[2] P. 144 f.

It means that the fruitful desire for virtue will be created in the forgiven heart. It means 'the perfect law of liberty' and 'being led by the spirit,' in fact, all that is summed up in the words, 'the grace of God.' In his great work called *Christianity and Fear*, Pfister, the Zürich theologian and practising psychologist, makes the point that nothing but taking the forgiving love of God in its absolute sense can get religion free from the fear-neuroses which arise when it is limited by ideas of law or ritual; those neuroses which gave rise to persecutions and the obsessions of formalism. Jesus, he says, 'treated as an absolute truth, God's forgiving grace without exaction of penalty or sacrifice. Penitence then ceases to become an act of dread and becomes an act of trust.' [1] In the course of Jesus' ministry, repentant sinners, because He convinced them of this, poured out their gratitude to Him like the woman who bathed His feet with tears.

But where was any objective guarantee for this gospel? Jesus was understanding and feeling with an intensity beyond our imagination how difficult, even how doubtful, to a sensitive and pure conscience is the idea that the Holy God should freely pardon. There is no reason in it. No rationale of a sacrificial system supports it, nor any principle of moral jurisprudence.

There is, however, an objective guarantee for it now, namely, the historic fact that Jesus lived through this agony of doubt and then died in the serenity of faith, taking His place again with those who make little of the mere cutting of the last thread. With breath still in His body and the realization that all His strength is gone He says, 'It is finished.' It is in these words, and in the last utterance of peaceful faith, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' that we find the seal of Jesus' work for men, a historic seal, independent of, though afterwards confirmed by, the Resurrection. His own limitless forgiving love for men had not after all broken His fellowship with the Father. Therefore, it can be taken as the revelation of the mind and will and love of God.

Such an interpretation finds the ultimate ground of faith and assurance of salvation in the spiritual agony through which Jesus passed and from which He emerged in His Passion. And that is where it does rest.

> On Christ, the solid rock, I stand;
> All other ground is sinking sand.

But it is not a narrow interpretation. It leaves room for contributions from many fields—one may mention studies of Hebrew notions about sacrifice or of ethical principles—but it imposes one condition, that such contributions enrich or deepen our insight into the psychology of the anguish in which Jesus uttered the cry of dereliction and the quiet faith in which He died.

[1] *Christianity and Fear*, 177 ff., 215.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Christ is Risen!

By the Reverend John G. Williams, B.A.,
Church of England Schools Council

I think one of the most exhilarating experiences in life is to get up early and watch the dawn on a lovely fresh Spring morning. Dawn is always a magic experience, especially a calm, still dawn after a wild and stormy night. It is as if the sun, rising slowly in the East, is putting to flight all the grim powers of darkness. And Spring-time too, when you think of it, is a kind of dawn; for when Spring comes (as it is coming now) we know that the long darkness of Winter is over. The snowdrops and crocuses and daffodils are pushing their way up through the lifeless soil; the green buds are beginning to show again on the trees that looked so dead; the days are slowly growing warmer and brighter and longer as the dead world comes back to life again.

That is why it was so very fitting that, when Jesus came back from the grave and rose again from the dead, it should have happened, as it did, not only at dawn, but at dawn on a morning in Spring-time. A lovely Spring dawn is a perfect expression of the whole spirit of Easter.

For think. On Good Friday it seemed to those friends and followers of Jesus as if the sun had set and would never rise again. Evil and death had triumphed. Jesus had been defeated and done to death by wicked men. His own trusted followers had run away in a panic, just at the moment when He most needed them, and left Him to die alone. From a safe distance they had watched Him die on a Cross on that lonely hill-top outside Jerusalem.

For them, surely, that was the end. All they had lived and hoped for was now finished. They were beaten and in despair. I picture them, overcome with shame at their own cowardice and yet still mortally afraid of being caught and condemned to the same agonizing death as their Master, hiding themselves huddled together behind locked and

barred doors in some Jerusalem back street, expecting at any moment to hear the knock that would tell them that their enemies had tracked them down in their hiding-place; they were eating their hearts out in black despair and utter hopelessness.

So, in shame and terror and aching misery, the dark hours of Good Friday and Holy Saturday dragged on—and dawn broke on Easter Sunday. Suddenly in the silence there was a startled cry. Some of the women friends of Jesus who had gone early to the tomb to finish the embalming of His body burst into the darkened room with the most astonishing news—Jesus has gone. The body has disappeared. The tomb is empty. Come and look for yourselves. They went and looked—Peter and John first—and it was true. And shortly afterwards (while they were still puzzling about this strange thing and discussing it in frightened whispers) Mary Magdalene, the woman whom Jesus had rescued from a life of sin, came to them and said, 'I have *seen* the Master. He is alive. He is risen.' And that night all of them (except Thomas, who had to wait another week) saw Him with their own eyes.

'Christ is Risen!' Suddenly, all in a Spring dawn, the black misery of that Friday and Saturday was swallowed up in that triumphant cry which has been echoing through the world ever since; those words with which Christians in every land, each in their own tongue, still greet one another on Easter morning—'Christ is Risen; He is Risen indeed!' And those first followers, who ran away on Good Friday because they were afraid to die with Jesus, went out fearlessly to tell the whole world the glorious news—and gave their lives to tell it. And to-day, in our own world, men and women and children are still suffering, as they did, persecution and torture and death for their faith in the Risen Christ; so let us remember to say a prayer for them as we worship the Risen Christ on Easter morning.

All glory, praise and thanksgiving be unto Thee, O Christ, because on the first Easter Day Thou didst rise from the grave, triumphing over sin and death, and art alive for evermore.

What Kind of a Tongue?

By Rita F. Snowden, Auckland, New Zealand

Have you ever had measles? Or chicken-pox? Or scarlet fever?—all of which are very nasty things to have. If you have, then you will have had a visit from the doctor.

I wonder if you can remember the first thing that the doctor asked you to do? Yes. To put out your tongue. Do you remember him saying, 'Can I see what sort of a tongue you've got?' And perhaps it surprised you that he should ask to see your tongue when the spots weren't on your tongue at all but on your arms or your chest.

But the doctor can tell a lot by a boy's or a girl's tongue.

Of course, tongues differ a great deal. You have noticed the pussy's tongue. And what good use she makes of it—keeping her furry coat clean and smooth.

The large cousins of the pussy—lions and tigers—have tongues so rough that one lick will rasp the skin from a man's hand. It is just as well lions don't get measles and have to call in the doctor. I don't think the doctor would like to say to those big fellows, 'Let me see your tongue.'

And it is a good thing that giraffes don't get measles and have to call in the doctor, because a grown-up giraffe has a tongue eighteen inches long.

And it is a good thing that frogs don't get measles and have to call in the doctor because a frog's tongue, instead of being hinged at the back of the mouth, is hinged in the front, and lies pointing backwards. But it works very quickly when capturing insects. But I don't know what the doctor would make of a tongue that went back to front.

Then there is the funny little lizard called the chameleon which has a tongue nearly as long as its body. What a good thing boys and girls don't have tongues nearly as long as their bodies—what a lot of eating they would do, and what a lot of talking! And it would be a little difficult for the doctor. But the chameleon does not mind that kind of tongue—he's used to it. And he can shoot it in and out at a surprising rate when insects come by.

So there are a lot of different kinds of tongues. Happily, God knows the best kind for boys and girls—not tiny and pink like the pussy's, big and rough like the lion's and tiger's, not eighteen inches long like the giraffe's, nor back to front like the frog's, nor as long as the chameleon's.

Jesus had a friend called Peter whose tongue was always getting him into trouble. It was a very quick tongue—quick to make promises, and just as quick to change round and say the opposite thing. And it got him into lots of trouble. It even led him to deny his friend Jesus—and when Peter realized what his tongue had done, he went out and wept. Peter never forgot that. And after Jesus had been crucified, and had come alive again on Easter Day, Peter made his tongue say three times over how very much he really did love Jesus—to try and cross out from memory the three horrid times when his quick tongue had said that he didn't even know Him.

And long afterwards, when Peter wrote a letter to his friends, he put in a special little bit about

that. He said, ' He that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil.' ' Refrain,' means ' keep.' So Peter's letter really reads : ' He that will love life and see good days, let him *keep* his tongue from evil ' (1 P 3^{10}).

What kind of a tongue have you got ? No, you needn't put it out—you can save that for the doctor—because it mightn't give me the answer I want. Is it an evil tongue—saying all kinds of mean, bad-tempered, spiteful things ? Or is it a happy tongue—loving best of all true things and kind things and pleasant things ?

The Christian Year

Palm Sunday

By the Reverend Stuart W. McWilliam, M.A., S.T.M., Aberdeen

' Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.'—Mt 21^5.

I want you to look back with me, a long way back, to the first Palm Sunday, to that day, over nineteen hundred years ago when Christ our Lord rode into Jerusalem. We'll have to use our imagination a bit in order to build up the picture, but I think we can manage it.

It is a bright, cloudless day. The sky is a deep unfathomable blue and the sun a sphere of burning gold. The crowd which lines the dusty white road is full of colour with splashes of blue and purple, of brown and red and white from the variously coloured robes of the people mingling with the vivid green of the palm branches which they are waving in the air. There is the constant unending murmur of many voices, broken every now and then by a tremendous shout of Hosanna. But above all there is something which cannot be seen or heard, something which can only be felt—a tingling sense of excitement and tension, an almost unbearable expectancy.

And now let us look more closely at some of those people who make up this vast crowd. See that dark, wild-eyed individual with the suspicious-looking bulge under his robe, note how his hand keeps returning to it every now and again, and how he seems to be watching rather than participating, assessing rather than joining in the general rejoicing. He is a Zealot, and that is a dagger which he keeps fondling. He is one of the most fanatical of Jewish patriots, hating Rome with a devouring, insatiable hatred, and he is hoping that this move of our Lord's will be but the prelude to bloody revolution. What does it matter who the leader may be, if only the people of Israel be roused to revolt. A friend of his, a man named Barabbas, was caught by the Romans only last week and is at present lying in prison under sentence of death. The revolution, if it comes, will be too late for Barabbas, but at least he will not have died in vain. And did you see the man who, just a moment ago, slipped away from the crowd and is now hurrying, almost running towards the city ? That was one of the ecclesiastical Gestapo, a spy hired by the Chief Priest, and he is now hastening back to give his master the latest report on this troublesome Carpenter of Nazareth. Now take a look at the fat, prosperous looking gentleman over there, the one with the oily smirk on his face and the cold, shrewd, unsmiling eyes. See how cautiously he glances round before giving a half-hearted shout of Hosanna, rather like a polite ' Hear ! Hear ! ' at a board of directors' meeting. Joseph ben Amos is his name. He is a wealthy merchant, who owns a chain of stalls in the Temple courtyard. Religion is his business, and a very good business too. This Jesus may make it even better. On the other hand He may prove rather a nuisance. Joseph ben Amos is a careful man ; he didn't amass his shekels by being a fool, and he is not taking any risks. He is waiting to see which way the cat will jump.

That fellow over there is just shouting because every one else seems to be shouting. He has not the least idea what it is all about, but he is the type who cannot resist a show of any kind, and there are quite a number of them here to-day. They love sensations, the type of people who will stand for hours waiting to see some matinée idol, the type of people who to-day read the *News of the World* in bed on Sunday morning. But look at the adoration in the face of that young man there ! The one whose dress shows that he comes from Galilee, and see that woman lifting up her child so that the babe may see Jesus and perhaps even be blessed by Him. These people obviously know and love the Master, for them this is a truly glorious day. But here we are at Jerusalem. Jesus rides through the gates and the crowd surges in after Him and the road is empty, deserted, with just a few palm branches, their leaves wilted and discoloured, trodden into the dust, to show that He has passed. With this picture in mind, let us try to analyse the main types of reaction to Christ's triumphal procession into Jerusalem.

1. There were those who were afraid ! Afraid because if Jesus were made king then they stood to lose something, money, power, position, security, something upon which they placed a great deal of value. Why is it that every tyrant in history has persecuted the Church ? Why, because tyrants fear the Church, and with good reason. The teaching of Christ strikes at the very roots of their power. They cannot enslave the souls and bodies of men as long as faith in Christ is alive.

One Palm Sunday, four hundred and fifty years ago, Savonarola, preaching to a great crowd in the city of Florence, cried : ' It is the Lord's Will to give a new head to this city of Florence.' The people listened eagerly, waiting to hear who this new head was to be, and then he went on, ' The new head is Christ ! Christ seeks to be your king ! ' And at this a great enthusiasm stirred the crowd and they all took up the cry ' Long live Jesus ! King of Florence ! ' But only a year later they brought Savonarola out into that same square and there put him to death before the eyes of all, and the same people stood by consenting in his death. His zeal for Christ had proved too disturbing to those in power.

One Palm Sunday in the year 1938 I went to church in the little German university town of Marburg, and heard that day a sermon which I have never forgotten. At the time I had been only a short time in Germany and by mistake I went to a Nazi Church, one of that very small minority of churches where the ministers were wholeheartedly in favour of Hitler and his works. The preacher began by describing the entry of Christ into Jerusalem and from it he drew a parallel with the entry of Hitler into Vienna which had taken place fairly recently. While comparatively few people hailed the entry of Christ into Jerusalem that of Hitler into Vienna was triumphantly acclaimed by eighty million Germans. He left no doubt in one's mind as to which event he regarded as the more significant. Fifteen years have passed. The Nazi saviour is buried under the ruins of his chancellory in Berlin where he died like a rat caught in a trap. But the message of Palm Sunday remains, the message of Christ the King. Had this kind of thing happened only once one might regard it as interesting but unusual, but it has happened over and over again. No tyrant has ever managed to destroy the power of the Church and in the end every tyrant has been destroyed himself. No wonder they fear. But not only they. There are many who will fight to the last gasp to prevent Christ being made King because they know that if He is made King their day is done.

2. Secondly, among that crowd there were those who were indifferent. They did not know what it was all about and they did not bother to find out. I don't know what their pleasures were in these days, but as long as they had the equivalent of their football matches, their beer and their cigarettes, nothing else counted. Indifference ! Surely this is one of the great dangers in our country to-day. Democracy which has survived the fearful onslaught of two World Wars aimed at its destruction is likely to perish because of sheer apathy.

In the Church we know only too well the danger of apathy and indifference. For this is the trouble with many outside the Church and not a few within. They do not care enough to join either one side or the other. They will stand and wave palm branches on Sunday, but a few days later they will be part of the crowd which watches Christ die on the Cross. None of these things will really affect them. They will go home after each event and get down to the really serious business of deciding what to do with the next day off and which branch of entertainment they should patronize.

3. Those who were inspired. They shouted Hosanna, because they really meant it. They gladly recognized the kingship of Jesus. And let us give thanks to God that there are always those who are inspired. They sang His praise in the catacombs and in the Roman arena. They praised Him even when they were being burned at the stake. In Scotland they left their homes, their friends, their possessions and sang His praise among the peat hags and the heather-clad hills. They praised Him with their lives. Some of them left names that will for ever be honoured in the annals of our land, but many were unknown beyond the little circle in which they lived. But these were and these are the Church of the living Christ. And to-day the great need is for men and women inspired by Christ. In one of his books Dr. Fosdick tells how one night in a certain little town in America one of the churches was burned down and two neighbours found themselves standing side by side watching the blaze. Said the first in a jocular fashion, ' This is the first time I have ever seen you at church.' Said the other : ' This is the first time I have ever seen a church on fire.' And, surely, that is what is needed to-day, a church on fire. A friend of mine who goes to many churches—not to preach, but to listen—said to me the other day, ' You know, men and women can see that the world of Nature is majestic, splendid, lovely. If they do not get the idea that the world of grace is even more splendid, even more glorious and even more lovely, then there is something very far wrong.' But do they get that idea, or do they feel that religion is just incredibly dull and unadventurous ? You remember Saul Kane, the converted drunkard's description of his conversion.

O glory of the lighted mind,
How dead I'd been, how dumb, how blind.
The station brook, to my new eyes,
Was babbling out of Paradise ;
The waters rushing from the rain
Were singing Christ has risen again.

Oh, the glory of the lighted mind ! Do you feel that ? Do other people feel it when they meet

you? The choice before the world to-day is a Church burning with the fire which does not consume, or a world burning to destruction.

We are the crowd this Palm Sunday. And as the Victor Christ rides past throwing out His challenge to the world, what is our reaction? Fear? Indifference? Or enthusiasm? Shall we march with Him to conquer in His name? Or shall we join the crowd which demands His death?

Easter Day

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Glasgow

'Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.'—Jn 20^{16}.

It is an amazing thought that at this moment, in every part of the world from New Zealand and Australia, through the islands of the Pacific, Ceylon and India, the countries of Europe, Africa and America, men and women in their millions and hundreds of millions are hailing with joy the same Divine fact which brings us together. Everywhere, even in Russia and China, men are giving thanks that, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one years ago, the crucified body of one Man rose from the grave; are seeing in this fact the one great hope in a world haunted by the fear of death. In Rome the forty days' fast of Lent and the gloomy ceremonial of Good Friday are giving way to the rejoicing of Easter Day. The bells of all the churches are being rung, and with all ceremony and pomp the fact of our Lord's resurrection is being hailed.

1. It is an amazing thing and somewhat cheering, but I sometimes wonder if we do well so to celebrate Easter. Elijah found God, not in the earthquake, the thunder, or the storm, but in the still, small voice. When Christ was raised, it was not with thunderings or lightnings, but so softly and silently that no man knew that it had happened until He met Mary Magdalene and said 'Mary.' This stupendous, world-shaking fact, the most significant happening in all history, was announced to the world, not in banner headlines, but by the speaking of a woman's name in the silence of dawn in a Garden. No man saw the stone rolled away. That night folks slept soundly in bed, went out to parties, lay awake in pain or fever. Not so much as by the ringing of a bell was it announced that God had broken open the gates of death. The first intimation was in this one word, spoken to a poor creature in whose mind the memory of the life of shame from which He had rescued her was still fresh. 'Mary', that was all. Like the gentle waking of a child from sleep, like the coming of love, like the bursting of the buds in Spring, it all happened so silently as to go quite unnoticed by the great bustling world—unnoticed by all until this one woman came in the dawning to the Garden.

2. Not only did the Resurrection happen quietly, but it happened naturally. The disciples were surprised when they heard of it. They should not have been. They should have known that it would happen. Time and again Christ had told them that He would die, and that He would be raised again on the third day. They, who had heard Him speak, and seen the sort of things He did and the life He lived, should have expected it. The Resurrection of Christ was, as we say, all of a piece with the rest of His life, all part of one consistent whole. Moreover, the God who made and rules the world is no different from, no other than, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Resurrection is a fact of Nature. They, who knew full well the facts of birth, and of how the generations as they pass away are yet reborn and live again in their children, should have expected that when God gave His Son to death it must only be to raise Him anew. Those who know God in Nature should not find it hard to accept this miracle among the myriad others.

If the Resurrection had not happened, what would it have meant? Pilate, that weak and vacillating man, would have had the final word. Evil would have been proved stronger than good, hate stronger than love, force stronger than righteousness. It would have shown that the last word was always with the big battalions. Is that your reading of history, brethren? Is that your reading of your own life? Is it not true that in history evil always finally overreaches itself? Is it not true in your own life that the only things which have endured have been the good and true and kindly things? In 1935 two men were at work. Adolf Hitler was being acclaimed by screaming thousands, his name was on every lip. In Cambridge a quiet man named Alexander Fleming was faithfully working in his laboratory, unknown except to a handful of people; penicillin was being discovered. Does Hitler's work endure or Fleming's? Is Hitler's name or Fleming's the more honoured now?

As we look back on our own lives, what has really mattered? Is it our ambitious striving, our greedy struggles, our victories over our brethren? Is it not rather the kindnesses we have shown or received, the few true and gentle and loving words we have spoken, or the deeds we have done? On his death-bed a man's honours and achievements, his wealth and distinctions fall away. All that endures in the face of death are his little acts of kindness, his character, his integrity. But these do endure; these are stronger than death.

It is not resurrection that is a mystery. The mystery would have been if there had been no Resurrection. The Rising of Christ was inevitable. He could not remain dead; it was impossible for Him to be holden of death. It was *natural*, for it was the rising of *Jesus*, the sinless One, in whose life and character there had been none of the evil that breeds death, who had been completely at one with the Father, the Giver of life. And so Christ did not proclaim His rising with a great and terrible noise. In a single word spoken to His friend, the fact is announced as the most natural thing in all the world. In a gentle stillness, in utter simplicity, Jesus said 'Mary.'

3. Thirdly, notice how personal a thing the Resurrection was, and is. The announcement of the wondrous fact is made, not in a communiqué to a court of kings, not to a gathering of the wise, not in an assembly of the religious; it is made to one simple woman—'Mary.' It is common to speak of Easter as being the victory over sin and death and hell. Certainly, in an age such as ours, we need the assurance that good is finally victorious, the reminder that however long the struggle, the triumph of Christ is assured at the end. It is right to see in the Resurrection a world-shaking event, the bursting of the bonds of death, the redemption, in some sort, of the whole creation.

Yet, most important of all, is what Easter says to the individual human being. God chose to become flesh in one man. He dealt with people one by one. He told of His rising to one person, and it is still so. For if we listen this Easter morning we shall hear Him speak our new name to us, just as softly, as naturally, as simply, as personally as Mary did so long ago. Christ speaks, not at large to the world, but to you and to me, just where we are, and as we are, in the here and now. If you are approaching this time with an aching heart, with the knowledge of a great gap in your home and life, you will find healing in the greeting of the Risen Christ. If you are approaching it with a crushing sense of the evil in the world, and with a great fear in your heart, Christ will speak calm and reassurance and power. If your battle is with some old sin or some fierce temptation, His voice speaks of victory and tells that the struggle is not in vain. If you are rejoicing in some rich and new-found joy, Christ's greeting assures you that the half hath not been told, for the best is for ever.

Not to some general average, some lowest common denominator of humanity, but to each quiet and listening soul Christ speaks. It may be that all He says is your name, but if it is the Risen Lord who speaks it, it is enough. Directly, naturally, personally, He says it, and we hear. We know that we have found our Lord, the Lord of comfort, reassurance, victory, and hope, the Lord who claims us, and from whom we cannot keep the utter allegiance of our heart and life. When it is Christ who speaks, the only word that we can say in reply is the word that sprang to Mary's lips—'Master.' If the hope, and joy, and comfort, and peace of Easter have flooded our hearts when we heard Christ speak our name, we will not count it hard to reply as Mary did—'Master,' or to obey the command He gave to her—'Go to my brethren.'

This is the word for which the great heart of the world aches and longs—the Word made flesh, the Word of love from the midst of the Cross, and the Word from the other side of Calvary. 'Jesus saith unto her, 'Mary.' She saith unto him, 'Rabboni,' which is to say, 'Master.' Jesus saith unto her, 'Go to my brethren.' Blessed are we, and only blessed, if this dialogue be ours this Easter-tide.

First Sunday after Easter

The Authenticated Word

By the Reverend Harold G. Newsham, M.A., Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.

'And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side.'—Jn 20^{20}.

Our troops used to have a rough and ready, but eloquent, classification of officers. They had several classifications—but that is another story! The one I have in mind, now, is that division of officers into the 'Go on' type, and the 'Come on' type. Gilbert immortalized the 'Go on' brigade in the warrior who led his regiment from behind; he found it less exciting. And George Bernard Shaw in *St. Joan* gave us the contrast. Says La Hire, a spokesman for the rank and file of the Maid's army, 'I could follow her to hell, when the spirit rises in her . . .'; and the operative verb, you notice, is 'follow.'

It is much the same with those to whom we are willing, on certain occasions and on certain matters, to listen. We prefer instructors and guides who have been through the fire; not mere theorists from the fireside. The necessary credentials for speech in certain serious concerns are the scars of conflict and the wounds of experience. Life is too baffling and desperate a business. in the ultimate issue, for any other convictions than these to carry weight.

You see, no doubt, where this is leading. One of the most dramatic scenes any chronicler has ever sought to describe was that which occurred in Jerusalem shortly after the Crucifixion of a certain Nazarene, Jesus by name. His closest

companions, who had scattered upon His arrest, had made their way back to the one room in that city of dreadful night with which they were all poignantly familiar. There is no question as to their state of mind. They were frightened men, if ever men were. They were not so much gathered together as huddled together. Moreover, they were men whose fear was aggravated by conscience; by a sense of guilt. For not one of them had stood by his Master to the last. Not one had said, 'Where Thou goest I will go; and where Thou diest I will die.' The one who might have been their natural leader now, as he had often been in the past, was sunk in his own sight for ever in ignominy. Would his ears ever cease to be haunted by those dreadful oaths of denial that he had ever known the Man? Frightened—whose turn might it not be next? Ashamed—for what spark of courage had any one of them shown in the end? They were also broken, without a glimmer of hope, or plan, or purpose. They were not a resistance-movement. There was no shadow of a thought of continuing the campaign of their executed Leader. All they had ever believed and dreamed was in ruins.

And then, on the instant, all is changed. Simply, and it is better so, the chronicler quietly writes that Jesus came, and stood in the midst of them and said, 'Peace be unto you.' Then he adds these significant words, for the sake of which I am retelling this tremendous story. 'And when Jesus had so said, he shewed them his hands and his side.'

He said 'Peace be unto you.' And He showed them His hands and His side. He said. And He showed. This lovely word 'Peace' on His lips. But in His body those awful wounds; those evidences, surely, of precisely those evils and horrors in our world, those bigotries and passions and blindnesses in men, which make it so difficult to believe in the God of goodness and of loving power, so difficult to believe that anything godlike can ever come of our gross human nature.

What Jesus showed—didn't it make moonshine of what He was saying?

Those terrible wounds, those impossibly lovely words! Didn't the wounds murder the words? They seemed to have done, but a few hours before on that rocky spur known as Golgotha, the place of a skull.

But now it was all the other way round. The wounds were the mighty confirmation of the words. In a world like this, the words were unbelievable, save on the lips of One who had suffered in His own person the worst that the injustice, the cruelty, the bestiality of men could perpetrate, and who could emerge from it all still saying, 'Peace. Be of good courage. Hope on. Believe on. Build on. The kingdoms of this world rise, and have their hour, and fall. But My kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.'

What but those wounds could have given Jesus the right thus to speak; an authority, to be heard, uniquely His? It is as though all other leaders and teachers and would-be saviours of men have never quite been able to say 'Come on, men' as Jesus could; say it from the other side of betrayal, rejection, agony, and death, endured through no compulsion of circumstance alone, but voluntarily, through that unfathomable love for God and for us men. He can say, because He can show.

If when the doors are shut, Thou drawest near,
Only reveal those hands, that side of Thine.
We know to-day what wounds are, have no fear.
Show us Thy scars, we know the countersign.

'Peace be unto you.' What is it that those words, backed by those wounds, would say to us?

First, they are speaking comfort to every one whose memories cherish the sound of a voice that is still, and the touch of a hand that was dear. When what Jesus says is endorsed by what He shows, we have sufficient for a quiet heart and a radiant faith. 'Their souls are in the hand of God, and no evil shall touch them.'

Second, it is a word of forgiveness to the uttermost. 'Peace be unto you.' Yet there they were, too ashamed when they knew Him to look Him in the eyes. How could they ever forgive themselves, these men who had lost the faith and ideals of the years in one single, fateful hour? How could Peter ever lift up his head and voice again, after that cowardice, and worse, of his in the courtyard of Caiaphas? Yet, here is the wonder of it, as wonderful as Creation's morning when the Spirit of God spoke to chaos and primeval night. Peace be unto you—unto men as shamefaced, as torn with guilt, as defeated as these. Yet it was so! It was so, as when God said 'Let there be light; and there was light.' For it is these self-same men who were to pass into history as apostles, as martyrs, as the chivalry and knights of the Crucified. Why they were ever heard of again is a question only the life-giving power of the Risen Christ can answer. Wherefore, if any one to-day is stained with shame, I care not of what sort or depth it be, that same Christ is saying to you: 'Peace be unto you.' And the proof of the uttermost lengths to which that forgiveness reaches is His showing to you His hands and His side.

Finally, His words would rally us against all faintheartedness, all cynicism, all disenchantment, all despairing pessimism. 'Look at your world,' there are those who say—there is that in us which is sometimes tempted to cry—'you talk about the Love of God. You bleat about His purpose for this world of ours and its teeming millions. But

set over against all the gossamer of your Gospel words, the battlefields; the dead and maimed; the inhumanities of man to man. Add to it all the absence of any evidence as yet that it is leading to any ultimate good; that a world where ordinary home-loving, decent folk, who take pleasure in the simple joys of life, and who loathe the abominations of war, is really coming to the birth.'

Yes, were it solely a tussle in our souls between fair words and grim realities, I cannot doubt which would gain the victory. But it isn't. The words have realities behind them, too; the scars and wounds of the Victor. Our faith is not in One who merely theorized or speculated, or wrote an inspiring book, or left to us the vivid beauty of a dream. Our faith is in a Fact, rooted and grounded in the rock of history. It is rooted and grounded in the fact that the Cross, the very outrage, the very tragedy, the very horror, which should finally have 'put paid' to all words about a Heavenly Father, to all notions that the sons of Adam are potential children of God, actually became the crowning evidence for, and the Glory Song of, the Christian Faith. That is at once history's most amazing, yet most indubitable, Fact. Thereafter, from that day when Jesus said, 'Peace be unto you,' and then showed His hands and His side, no set-backs, no recrudescence of wrong and barbarism, no threat of darkness, can do other than fade into the background of our consciousness when, in the foreground, is the wonder of that Victory and that Majesty.

I have a Captain, and the heart
Of every private man
Has drunk in valour from his eyes
Since first the war began:
He is most merciful in fight,
And of his scars a single sight
The embers of our failing might
Into a flame can fan.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

The Blood of Christ

BY THE REVEREND RODERIC DUNKERLEY, B.A., B.D., PH.D., KELVEDON

'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'—1 Jn 1^{7}.

One often wonders what people actually mean when they sing—

His blood can make the foulest clean,
His blood availed for me.

I am not, of course, doubting that in many cases there is both sincerity of conviction and reality of experience. But what is the connexion between the experience and the language used to describe it? And may it not be that some people miss the experience or at least something of the depth and joy of it through misunderstanding of the language?

Members of the old 'blood-and-fire' school of thought often use these words and similar hymns and the Scriptural texts on which they are based as though they were thinking of the actual physical blood of the human body of Jesus. But, of course, the language is figurative, like so much else in the Bible. 'Underneath are the everlasting arms'—we do not think of God as having two great arms of flesh and blood outstretched to defend us. 'If I with the finger of God cast out devils . . .'; and so forth. We must always get beneath the picture language to the spiritual reality symbolized.

The strangest example of this usage is the employment of the word 'bowels' where the meaning is as the Revised Version shows 'tender mercies.' The Jews thought of the tender emotions as located physically in the bowels—an odd idea to us but no more erroneous than our thought of the heart as the seat of the affections.

Now it is, of course, against this background that the use of the word 'blood' in Bible and hymn book is commonly to be understood. It is a figure of speech. As 'the life of the flesh is in the blood' so quite naturally life sacrificed for others is pictured as the shedding of blood, though no actual drops of blood fall from the body. There is a striking example of this usage in the beautiful story of David pouring out upon the ground the water from the well at Bethlehem which three of his mighty men had fetched for him, saying—'Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should drink this: is not this the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?'

When, therefore, we read about the 'blood of Jesus Christ' it is surely clear that the meaning is the self-giving Love—once fully manifested on earth but ever and eternally the same. Once He dwelt amongst men 'in loveliness of perfect deeds' and enduring the contradiction of sinners against Himself died in long-suffering forgiving love. Still and ever that Love remains the same—bearing and forbearing, calling and recalling, pardoning and redeeming, a love that will not let us go. 'We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.'

If we use this symbolism of blood we must endeavour to keep clearly in mind the truth behind the symbol. And certainly if we use it with children and young folk we must make strenuous efforts to help them to see the real thought behind such expressions. It is terribly easy for them to get completely fogged by much talk of being washed in the blood of the Lamb, and never to get to the heart of the matter at all. For practical purposes we can nearly always use the word 'love'

instead of 'blood,' so long as we still use it with the fullness of the Divine message of Him, whose

> . . . ceaseless unexhausted love,
> Unmerited and free,
> Delights our evil to remove,
> And help our misery.

I am not suggesting, of course, that the Jews equated 'blood' with self-giving 'love'; in common with others who made use of blood sacrifices and burnt-offerings in many lands their thought was superstitious, materialistic, earthy. And without doubt the early Christians often carried over such ideas into their belief in the saving power of the blood of Christ, which is why such unspiritual notions have for so long permeated Christian theology. But I do say that it is only as we see spiritual truth beneath figurative language that we can speak to the needs of the realistic age in which we live, and bring home to the hearts of men and women—especially the young who have not been drugged with the more primitive conceptions—the essential truth of the Cross.

And it is valuable to observe that there is a fact of modern life which can be of great service in this respect. I refer to the miracle of blood transfusion. Blood from a healthy body is under certain circumstances given to a diseased one with cleansing strengthening power. It is a parable of the purifying health-giving spirit of Christ being given to sin-sick souls—the inflowing and indwelling of the Divine Love with power to conquer and control the evil forces in the blood stream of humanity. This thought can give new point and meaning to the old picture language, and it has an appeal which the symbolism of the Temple sacrifices can never have for us to-day.

'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.' We all need a blood transfusion from Christ—indeed as is often the case in the hospitals not one only but many. We are spiritually anæmic —there are poison germs in our blood—the infection of worldliness has seized upon us—the taint of pride and self-will and lust is upon us. But, thank God, there is a way back to health again. There is One who once gave Himself for God's truth in perfect demonstration of the unconquerable love of God—One who ever lives in this same spirit and ever gives Himself to those who will open their lives to receive Him. The love of the ever-living, ever-giving Saviour is the blood that we need infused into our veins, if we are to live healthy, happy, holy lives to the glory of His name.

But we must still probe a little further. It is very easy to fall into the error of vagueness in these matters. We would do well to recall the saying of Jesus—'Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.' There is enlightening, purifying, strengthening power in the actual words of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels, as many have found and are constantly finding. And when His loving spirit enters and takes possession of our souls, we are being cleansed by the blood of Jesus. And similarly when some truth is borne in upon us from some other part of the Scriptures or from elsewhere we are being saved and sanctified by His love. As when Spurgeon heard the voice on Midsummer Common at Cambridge—'Seekest thou great things for thyself, seek them not,' he was being cleansed from ambition and made fit for the Master's use.

We should pray that we may continually share such experience. We should pray—

> Lord, make me willing to be taught,
> Responsive to the inbreathed thought.

Some of us are too satisfied too soon. After all, the promise is that He will cleanse us from *all* sin. Let us be deeply grateful for the measure in which we have already received His loving cleansing blood—let us ask for clear understanding of the respects in which we still need blood transfusion from Him to combat the poisons that still remain within us. Perhaps there is still pride—of position or class or party or intellectual achievement. Perhaps there is still prejudice. Is His blood really availing for us? It is easy to sing about it, but not so easy to let it really happen, fully and beautifully.

And what of our church life? Our churches are made up of individuals like ourselves—are they not also suffering from anæmia? During the last few days I have heard of one of our churches where the minister is desperately unhappy because there are two sets in the church, the well-to-do and the not-so-well-to-do, who do not mix! And there are churches like the one which a student mentioned to Dr. Alexander Whyte as being rather cold. 'Cold!' the old man cried, 'cold? I preached there two years ago, and I have not got the chill out of my bones yet!'

What is to be done? Perhaps we have been too quiet and gentle about such things. Perhaps we must be more blunt and outspoken. Twenty years ago Samuel Shoemaker wrote a book with the challenging title *The Conversion of the Church*. Perhaps that is a challenge that must be repeated —insistently, urgently. And the way of conversion is still the same—to allow the blood of Christ to cleanse us all, individuals and churches alike, from all sin—to allow His life-giving words of grace free entry and full scope—to allow His loving spirit of goodwill to all men to dominate our lives, leading us to forgiveness and compassion and long-suffering effort on their behalf. So will He dwell in us, as indeed He promised long ago.

The Rearrangement and Transmission of Mark ix. 11-13

By the Reverend C. Clare Oke, M.A., Th.D., Dover Centre, Ontario

Mk 9^{11-13} appears to be disarranged in its present form. The question in *v.* 11 is answered in *v.* 12a, but the question in *v.* 12b is unanswered in *v.* 13 unless the latter is taken to imply that the treatment of Elijah who has come in John the Baptist is an explanation of the suffering of the Son of Man, and that implication is by no means immediate and clear and it does not account for the *prediction* of suffering.

There have, of course, been rearrangements suggested. (*a*) One such is that of C. H. Turner in *The Study of the New Testament*, 61, and in his work on Mark in the Gore one-volume Commentary. It is as follows: *vv.* 10, 12b, 11, 12a, 13. The passage would then run,

> 'And they kept the saying, questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean, and how it was written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at nought. And they asked him, saying, "How is it that the scribes say that Elijah must first come?" And he said unto them, "Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things. But I say unto you that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him."'

But the trouble with this reordering is that it involves a joining of a present reference to the Resurrection with an allusion made six days before (see 9^{2}) to suffering and rejection and in the text of Mark to a passage seventeen verses away. Turner says that the reference was made 'only five days before' as though that were an easy gap to bridge for the disciples and for Mark's readers. But such a reading is not so easy and straightforward as he assumes. It is far easier to suppose that the reference to a prophecy of suffering should arise out of this incident itself. Moreover, Turner's argument implies that πῶς γέγραπται is the complete equivalent of δεῖ in 8^{31}. But the necessity of suffering for Christ may not have lain only in the prediction of it in Scripture but rather, or at least also, in the lamentable fact that the remission of sin, because man is so wedded to it, cannot be effected without the shedding of blood, that Christ in His self-sacrificing love and gentleness could not 'conquer,' to use T. S. Eliot's words in *Murder in the Cathedral*, but 'by suffering.'

(*b*) A second rearrangement is that of W. C. Allen in *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 124–125, with which I became acquainted *after* I had arrived at an arrangement satisfying to my own mind. The reason I mention the fact that I came upon Allen's reordering later than the framing of my own reconstruction is that there may be confirmation of its general correctness in that a second student came to a very similar conclusion independently. Allen first claims that we would obtain a more natural sequence if the clauses were arranged thus: *vv.* 11, 12b, 12a, 13a, c, b. But inasmuch as this would admittedly provide no reply to the second part of the question put by the disciples Allen would prefer, in addition to a transposition of *v.* 13a, c, b, before *v.* 12b, to emend καὶ πῶς into καὶ οὕτως. We would then have the following:

> 'They were asking Him, saying
> That "the scribes say that Elijah must first come?"
> And He said,
> "Elijah indeed will come and 'restore' all things;
> But I say to you that Elijah has already come as it is written of him,
> And they did to him what they willed.
> And so it is written of the Son of Man that He should suffer much and be set at nought."'

Regarding this A. W. F. Blunt writes, 'To propose this as an emendation seems a desperate course; but at any rate either Matthew [in 17^{10-12}] had something like this before him, or he himself rearranged the clauses to escape their logical difficulty' (*St. Mark*, 208). What is said there about Matthew is most emphatically to be noted.

(*c*) The rearrangement to which I came before learning of Allen's is quite similar to his. Instead of resorting, however, to emendation in addition to reordering, I would recommend simply a different translation of one clause, ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενηθῇ, at the end of *v.* 12. What I would read is this, *vv.* 11, 12a, 13, 12b:

> 'And they asked Him, "(How is it) that the scribes say that Elijah must come first?" And He said to them, "'Elijah' indeed does come first to 'reform' everything. But I tell you that Elijah has actually come and people have done to him whatever they wished, just as stands written of him. And how does it stand written of the Son of Man? He must 'suffer extremely' and 'be counted as nothing.'"'

The following points are to be noted :

(1) Allen's taking of *v.* 13c with Ἠλίας ἐλήλυθεν is a little too easy, and there is with that connexion no preparatory parallel of *predicted suffering* for the Son of Man which is the unquestionable burden of *v.* 12b. It is better to believe that the reference in *v.* 13c is to some as yet unknown uncanonical writing.

(2) This rearrangement is simpler than Allen's inasmuch as it involves just the taking of one verse, *v.* 13, before part of another, *v.* 12b.

(3) The point is not very important but πολλὰ can be taken not only as 'many things' but adverbially (so also Allen) as 'extremely' or 'intensely.' ἐποίησαν should be rendered 'people did.' Mark is fond of this impersonal plural; see Turner on 2^{18} and 3^{21}.

(4) My suggestion that ἵνα and the two subjunctives are to be taken as virtual imperatives is quite in line with Hellenistic grammar. 'An innovation in Hellenistic,' writes J. H. Moulton, 'is ἵνα c. subj. in commands, which takes the place of the classical ὅπως c. fut. indic. Whether it was independently developed, or merely came in as an obvious equivalent, we need not stop to inquire. In any case, it fell into line with other tendencies which weakened the telic force of ἵνα; and from a very restricted activity in the vernacular of the NT period it advanced to a prominent position in MGr syntax. . . . In the NT the clearest ex. is Eph 5^{33} ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα, which is correlated with ἀγαπάτω in the first clause. So 1 Co 7^{29}, 2 Co 8^{7}, Mk 5^{23} : Gal 2^{10} is the same construction put indirectly' (*Prolegomena*, 178 f.). In The Expository Times, xxxviii [1927], 428 f., D. S. Sharp drew attention to a probable occurrence of this idiom in Mk 2^{10}, 'But know assuredly that the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins on earth.' For this usage he refers to Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, pt. iv. 305a. In addition to the instances in Mark already mentioned, 2^{10} and 5^{23}, 'Do come and lay your hands upon her,' of this way of taking ἵνα and the subj., 14^{49} should, I think, be listed : 'But the scriptures must be fulfilled.' Other possible examples of this usage are to be found in the following passages :

Jn 1^{8} 'but he had to witness concerning the light.'
9^{3} 'but the works of God must be revealed by means of him.'
13^{18} 'but the scripture must be fulfilled.'
17^{2} 'Just as Thou hast given to Him authority over all flesh, He must give eternal life to all whom Thou hast given Him.'
17^{21} 'Just as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, they also must be in us.'
17^{23} 'they must be perfected into one.'
1 Ti 1^{3} 'Just as I requested you to remain in Ephesus, when I was on my way to Macedonia, you must charge certain persons to stop teaching different doctrine.'

It may be asked, if it is claimed that the present text is disarranged, why it should have become so. My suggestion is that it may have been desire on the part of Mark or some scribe to give priority to the reference to Christ that led to the putting of what is now *v.* 12b before *v.* 13. A similar Christocentric interest led in my opinion to disarrangement in Lk 19^{1-10}—*vv.* 9–10, 'Jesus said with respect to him . . .' give Jesus' response to the abuse of Zacchaeus in *v.* 7 and prepare, at least partly, for Zacchaeus' declaration in *v.* 8—but there in the reverse order of putting the 'Son of Man' utterance last for the sake of the climax.

Contributions and Comments

The Kingdom of God has Come

In his article in The Expository Times, lxiv. [December 1952], 89 ff., arguing that in the New Testament ἐγγίζειν may mean 'come' or 'arrive.' Mr. Hutton has overlooked one significant scrap of evidence. His point 14 is that in Mt $26^{45f.}$ ἤγγικεν should be translated 'has arrived,' and he adds, 'So also the parallel in Mark.' But the parallel to Mt 26^{45} is actually ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα (Mk 14^{41}). Matthew's object in using ἤγγικεν was no doubt to emphasize the correspondence with the following verse ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με, but the conclusion seems inevitable that the two verbs are here equivalent of one another. As Mr. Hutton remarks in his point 10, a similar substitution of ἐγγίζειν for Mark's ἔρχεσθαι occurs in Lk 18^{35}.

To the list of translators who have 'came up' or the like in Lk 22^{47} (Mr. Hutton's point 6) should be added Torrey, *The Four Gospels*. Elsewhere Torrey retains the traditional rendering of ἐγγίζειν.

Martin A. Simpson
Wiston, Biggar

Does Aretas Belong in 2 Corinthians or Galatians?

It still seems fairly generally agreed among New Testament scholars that 2 Corinthians is a composite work, consisting of excerpts from St. Paul's

letters. With the exception of the fragment mentioned in 1 Co 5^{9}, possibly embedded in 2 Co $6^{14ff.}$, none of the collection antedates 1 Corinthians. Several abrupt endings to passages in Philippians as well as in 2 Corinthians would be admitted, but is there anything as impossible in their present position as 2 Co $11^{32.\ 33}$? Can they justifiably be reckoned an afterthought, without doing violence to the previous statement? The verses seem out of context, out of style, quite out of connexion. Goudge seems to be one of the few commentators who hold that these 'verses may be a gloss which has crept into the text. St. Paul is no master of rhetoric, but the bathos here is almost intolerable, the two previous verses having brought the recital of his sufferings to a natural close.' Curiously there is no reference in Goudge to Gal 1^{17}, which was however referred to by Stanley in this context in his commentary. Gal 1^{17} states that after conversion Saul went to (Nabatean) Arabia, a detail not in Acts. This Arabian visit broke into his Damascus residence. In Gal 1^{17} St. Paul says, 'and again I returned to Damascus.' Is it not reasonable to suggest a combination of Goudge and Stanley, and think that the gloss which has crept into 2 Co 11 was no gloss in Gal 1? There was its origin and we should be right in inserting the whole verse in the apposite context between Gal 1^{17} and ^{18}. This was suggested by Dr. Rendel Harris thirty years ago. The passage in 2 Corinthians no longer betrays any sign of bathos; the passage in Gal 1 is enriched by verses much more in the style of 'reminiscing' Galatians than tense and short-phrased 2 Corinthians. It is worth noting in this connexion that the 'Epistle for Sexagesima Sunday' wisely leaves off with 2 Cor 11^{31}.

ERIC F. F. BISHOP

Glasgow

Casus Pendens

No one would claim that '*casus pendens*, followed by resumptive pronoun' (Moulton and Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 423 f.) is confined to New Testament Greek, but it seems worth while to quote a particularly neat classical instance from Menander (fragment 632 K.):

ὁ συνιστορῶν αὐτῷ τι, κἂν ᾖ θρασύτατος,
ἡ σύνεσις αὐτὸν δειλότατον εἶναι ποεῖ

G. M. LEE

Bedford

Recent Foreign Theology

Foreign Journals. There is rarely space in these columns to refer to the journals which are received, and which frequently contain articles of importance. The six issues of the Basel journal *Theologische Zeitschrift* issued during 1952 contain many valuable articles, of which only a few can be mentioned by title. These are on E. Buonaiuti and the Roman Church, by V. Valday; on Ro $2^{14ff.}$, by F. Flückiger; on the mediæval proofs of the existence of God and the missionary commission, by E. Buess; on Theology and Philosophy, by F. Buri; on Miracle and Sacrament in the New Testament, by P.-H. Menoud; on the Anglican Church, by Stephen Neill; on Pascal's thought on Might and Right, by A. Rich; on the rise of the oldest Baptist community, by F. Blanke; on the Zwickau prophets, Thomas Müntzer and the Baptists, by H. S. Bender; on the Mennonites and Pietism, by E. Crous; on Existentialism and the Christian Faith, by F. Flückiger; on the Habakkuk Commentary found amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls, by G. Molin; on Moravian practical theology in the sixteenth century, by F. Bednář; on the scene of Ezekiel's ministry, by C. Kuhl; and on Johannine literary criticism, by S. Mendner. In addition there are many shorter articles and notes, and valuable reviews. All that can here be indicated is the wide range of the articles and the value of the journal for all interested in any branch of theology. The articles are written throughout in German. They come from writers from Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Czechoslovakia, the United States, and England. The journal has, therefore, an international character which adds to its value.

Another Swiss journal, this time in French, is the *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*. Its four issues for 1952 include an article on the nature of phenomenology, by P. Thévenaz, spread over three issues; one on Jules Lequier as philosopher and theologian of freedom, by J. Grenier; one on the contemporary aesthetic situation, by J.-Cl. Piguet; one on the dialectic of Rousseau, by R. Derathé; one on Christ's prayer and ours, by A. de Quervain; one on the Biblical notion of time, by G. Pidoux; one on Faith, Belief, and Reason, by the veteran H.-L. Miéville, who celebrated his seventy-fifth birthday on 5th December 1952; one on the problem of faith healing, by F. Cardis. One whole number was an In Memoriam issue, devoted to the life and work of Georges Mottier. In addition there were many reviews, both extended and shorter. It will be seen that some of the articles here are on questions which

are much under discussion. To traverse their arguments would require more space than can be found, and they can be reported, as papers are sometimes read at American conferences, 'by title only.'

'Ρῆμα in the Septuagint. A Finnish doctoral dissertation [1] is devoted to the study of the use of ῥῆμα in the Septuagint, as the first part of an examination of its use in the Greek Bible of both Testaments. The author studies the frequency of the occurrence of the word in the various books of the Old Testament, and finds some surprising variations, which are indicated in tables, while in further tables at the end of the book he indicates the relative frequency of the use of ῥῆμα and λόγος in the various books. He finds that ῥῆμα is more frequent in the Pentateuch and λόγος more frequent in the books translated later. He then offers a semantic study of the Hebrew דָּבָר and of nouns from the root אמר, and also of the Greek ῥῆμα and λόγος, and concludes that ῥῆμα is the more natural Jewish rendering, reflecting the Semitic background of the translator, while λόγος shows closer contact with Greek thought and influence. The frequency of the use of ῥῆμα in the later books, where it is, however, less frequent than in the earlier, may be due to the influence of the earlier translations. The author also compares the MSS. A and B in their use of these words, and concludes that the text of A bears unmistakable traces of a Palestinian provenance, and the same is true of Theodotion's translation of Daniel as compared with the LXX. Much careful work has gone into this study.

The Jerusalem Bible. Three further volumes [2] of the new French translation of the Bible, which is being published under the auspices of the Dominican School in Jerusalem, have appeared. These contain Micah, Zephaniah, and Nahum, edited by A. George; Judges and Ruth, edited by A. Vincent; and Amos and Hosea, edited by E. Osty. The translations rest on a critical text, and immediately below the text are textual notes explaining any variations from the Massoretic text. Below these are brief exegetical notes. To each book of the Bible there is a short introduction. It is well known that Roman Catholic Biblical studies are now freer than they were formerly, and that there is the utmost interest in the Bible in Catholic circles. The present series is excellently adapted to foster and to guide that interest amongst a wide circle of readers. In the volume on Judges and Ruth the period of the Judges is defined as 1220–1040 B.C.—narrower than the reviewer would define it, though he agrees fairly closely with Father Vincent on the date of the Exodus. There is a good account of the political and religious background of the book, and a critical study of the composition of the work in which a long history from the earliest sources to the final completion of the book is recognized. In the volume on Amos and Hosea the editor is cautious about rejecting oracles as spurious, while recognizing the literary history of the books. He rejects the view that Amos was a cultic official, and on Hosea's marriage holds that a real marriage, and not an allegory, is intended, and that ch. 3 is the sequel to ch. 1. In the volume on Micah, Zephaniah and Nahum, the editor recognizes that all the oracles in Micah cannot be securely attributed to Micah simply because they are found in this book, and ascribes 4^{1-3} to the period of the Exile, but rejects the once fashionable dichotomy of the book into an authentic first three chapters and an inauthentic last four chapters.

Life in the Early Church. P.-H. Menoud, whose earlier work is known to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, has published a careful study of *Life in the Early Church* [3] as reflected in the New Testament, and based on Ac 2^{42}. He finds the four things mentioned in this verse to be characteristic of the New Testament Church. These are: continuance in the Apostles' teaching, not only as reflected in their oral teaching but as enshrined in the New Testament; communion with one another and with Christ in things material and spiritual; the breaking of bread, which is held to include the observance of the Lord's Supper; and prayer, both corporate and private. Perseverance in all these qualities is set forth as the mark of the true Church at all times. Throughout, this little study is balanced and marked by a deeply religious interest as well as sound scholarship, and many ministers may find it suggestive for the pulpit.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University

---

[1] E. Repo, *Der Begriff 'Rhēma' im Biblisch-Griechischen: eine traditions-geschichtliche und semologische Untersuchung: I. 'Rhēma' in der Septuaginta* [1951]. Helsinki.

[2] A. George, *Michée, Sophonie, Nahum* [1952]; A. Vincent, *Le Livre des Juges*; *Le Livre de Ruth* [1952]; E. Osty, *Amos, Osée* [1952]. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris; Fr. 285, 510, 390.

[3] *La Vie de l'Église naissante* (Cahiers Théologiques, No. 31) [1952]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris; Swiss Fr. 3.00.

Entre Nous

Religious Education : The Use of the Bible in the School.

At one point in the Coronation Service a Bible is put into the hands of the Sovereign, and these words are spoken : ' We present you with this Bible, the most valuable thing that this world affords. Here is wisdom : this is the royal law : these are the living oracles of God.' The school has the opportunity to put this same book into the hands of every child in the land, so that Sovereign and people alike may find truth at the same source. But the giving of the Bible to children in school involves consideration of what version is most likely to meet their needs ; at what age it should be introduced ; and how it should be used in the work of the class. (Its use in worship is a separate problem not to be treated here.) Although in recent years there have been produced many school books for Religious Instruction, the agreed syllabuses, both in England and in Scotland, still assume the Bible to be the text book in this work, and, if it is to be used efficiently, the questions asked above must be answered.

What version of the Bible should be used ? For the best results, all the class should have the same Bible. This does not mean that children should not be encouraged to have Bibles of their own, but in the work of the school there is real gain when a text, the same in all respects, is in front of every child. It may be asked whether these should be whole Bibles, or parts selected according to age, or to conform with a particular Scripture Syllabus. There is much still to be said for whole Bibles, even for chapter and verse divisions. By these the teacher is able to make his own selection, and is not hindered as he is even in the best of anthologies, from finding verses elsewhere which can illumine the study of a set passage. Leviticus, for example, can often afford information in simple language, which makes a custom or action even in the New Testament clear, and yet Leviticus is not likely to find a place in a selection. It is gratifying to find that more and more whole Bibles are being supplied for class use.

Many writers on Religious Instruction believe that modern versions are the most suitable for school purposes. While such opinion does well to draw attention to the difficulties of the language of the Authorized Version for the twentieth-century child, there are practical objections to modern versions. These are still expensive, especially for whole Bibles in good type, and even the most benevolent Authority or parent would question the cost of the American Revised Standard Version. Most churches, Sunday schools, and homes still use the Authorized Version. Would it not, then, be best to familiarize the child in school with the version which he is most likely to meet and use outside ? If the translation, at present being undertaken in this country, were widely accepted in the churches and among the people, and reasonable in cost, then the schools could use it. Till then, the best school text remains the Authorized Version, with type clear enough for the youngest and yet not too childish for the oldest, and strongly bound. Some of these are available with excellent pictures of scenes in the Bible lands to-day. The maps in such Bibles are of little use for school purposes, and so their presence or absence should not influence the choice.

The one exception which might be made to this is that the new Pelican translation of the Gospels has offered an inexpensive, if not too durable, book, which might be used with advantage in the Secondary School. Of course, modern versions are indispensable for the teacher.

At what age should it be introduced ? Outside the school a child is given a Bible as early as sentiment or custom may dictate, and many children in imitation of their elders carry Bibles to church before they are able to read at all. The school, dealing with children from this and very different backgrounds, must interest the child, as soon as he comes, in this book, and make its text familiar, not at first by putting it into his hands, but by telling stories from it. The wise teacher will have his own Bible on view, as a visual aid to the story's source, and, whenever possible, will use simple phrases from the text, so that the children will recognize these when they come to read for themselves (for example, the repetition of ' And God saw that it was good ' in telling about creation). A picture in the teacher's Bible can be an opportunity for the class to see and handle the book, and, when the first steps in reading have been successfully accomplished, simple verses may be read. Such an approach, based on well-told stories, should from the first awaken a desire in the child to have such a book for his own, and to read what it contains.

How should the Bible be used in schools ? The ability to read creates a new and dangerous situation as, in its early stages, it is not an ability to read anything. Reading difficulties are the same in the Bible as in other books, and if the teacher,

through zeal to give the Bible to the class, sets passages beyond their easy understanding, interest will flag. Some lessons must be taught without the children reading, well through the Primary School. And until children read easily, reading aloud can cause the Scripture lesson to become a reading lesson, where the emphasis is on pronunciation rather than on meaning. When children can read with ease, reading aloud is effective, especially where conversation is read dramatically, or one child reads a significant passage as a whole. Generally, silent reading of carefully selected verses, noted on the board, followed by questions and discussion, or some teaching followed by directed reading, revised in questions, will yield good results. A useful device is so to frame the question that it can be answered by reading a particular verse, and to ask as supplementary question, that the answerer say what the verse means in his own words. A similar device is for the teacher to read and 'targum' as he goes. So the slower members of the class begin to see the meaning of the text. Comparison of simple passages can make children think for themselves. For example, a study of Peter denying and Peter defiant, leading on to what has produced the change in Peter brings home the power of the Resurrection as no dogmatic statement could. Research or investigation lessons show their value, as the limit of the Primary School is reached, and beyond. An introduction to the Second or Third Gospel can begin with research about the authors from references supplied by the teacher. Group as well as individual assignments can be used, as in making partial biographies of the Twelve. Junior Secondary classes could be asked questions about emigration and the reasons for this, and then directed to verses about Abraham, and the study of his reasons for moving. Senior Secondary pupils could trace the causes of the rebellion after Solomon's death, or study the different sermons in Acts, to discover their common message. An approach to doctrine can likewise be made by study of selected groups of Bible passages.

The master aim is always so to use and to cause the Bible to be used by young people in school that the method becomes the means whereby they themselves shall discover 'Here is wisdom: this is the royal law: these are the living oracles of God.'

JOHN GRAY

Moray House, Edinburgh

Archaeology for Children

Junior Bible Archaeology (Epworth Press; 6s. 6d. net), by H. V. Morsley, a book of ninety-nine pages divided into twelve chapters, prefaces its account of discoveries in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Palestine with descriptions of how cities come to be buried and how the modern archaeologist proceeds when he excavates them scientifically; in its closing chapters it deals with various written records, from Sumerian clay tablets to Codex Sinaiticus, under the headings 'Cuneiform Writing,' 'Hieroglyphics,' and 'Alphabetical Writing.'

This book, we are told, was 'written for children of Secondary School age and for teachers of Religious Knowledge.' While it is clearly and simply written and is, in some ways, an admirable sketch of the subject, it must be used with caution. Occasionally, for example, the writer is guilty of such an unnecessary lapse as this: 'We can picture Abram as a little boy rushing out of school and making for the bazaar to spend his pocket-money on a toy or a parrot or perhaps a monkey.' At other times statements are made which are highly questionable, for example 'The book of Joshua tells us all about his campaign and the Amarna letters are simply the enemy account of the same thing. One of the letters actually mentions the name of Joshua.' But Joshua's invasion cannot be identified with the Habiru movement, nor is Joshua mentioned in the Amarna correspondence. In a note on the Dead Sea Scrolls it is said: 'One of the scholars engaged in the translation, Dr. Trevor, was accidentally killed in the street fighting in Jerusalem.' (A hyphen between 'street' and 'fighting' would make this sentence less ambiguous.) But it was Father Sowmy who lost his life then. Dr. Trever, for this is the correct spelling of the name, is still alive; he has been concerned with the publication rather than with the translation of the manuscripts. Scriptural quotations in this book usually follow the A.V.; among deviations introduced by the author the form 'Nebuchadnezzar' at Jer 43^{10} is no improvement.

In general it may be said that this book gives the impression not only of being based largely on works of a popular or semi-popular nature but also of using those sources rather uncritically. Thus the discerning reader of, for example, the chapter entitled 'Ur of the Chaldees' will distinguish carefully between archaeological data and imaginative reconstructions of patriarchal life; he will also supplement it by discoveries from Mari and Nuzu which are not used in this book.

W. D. MCHARDY

The University, London

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

READ AT HOME

for a London University

B.A. or B.D. DEGREE

In your leisure hours you do a certain amount of serious reading. But is this reading haphazard or is it *planned?* Has it a *definite objective?* Why not read with a view to crowning your efforts with a B.A. or B.D. Degree? Quite apart from other (and perhaps more material) advantages, the work of preparation will widen your outlook and keep you abreast with modern studies. In recent years many Ministers have taken Degrees by reading at home in their leisure hours under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall tutors.

LONDON B.D.: HEBREW NO LONGER COMPULSORY
Candidates may obtain a *Pass* at B.D. without offering Hebrew, but this subject is compulsory for those seeking Honours. If you are interested please mention B.D. when writing for Prospectus.

Open to all

London University Degrees are open to all, without the necessity of going into university residence or attending lectures. It is necessary only to pass three examinations (in some cases *two*). You can read for these at home without interfering with your pastoral duties.

Wolsey Hall Postal Courses

for these examinations are prepared and individually conducted by a staff of more than 100 University Graduate Tutors. The Courses comprise Lessons, Test Papers, Model Answers, correction of your work and solution of *all* difficulties by your tutors. A Guarantee is given that in case of failure, tuition will be continued *free*. Tuition fees are very reasonable and may be paid by instalments.

Write for Prospectus, to C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 20,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON & G. W. BACON LTD.
LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

Three Ever-Useful Series
Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE
Twenty Volumes and Index Volume
"Endless riches here for preachers."
London Quarterly Review
Price per Volume 16s. net. Index Volume 7s. net

THE GREATER MEN AND WOMEN OF THE BIBLE
Six Volumes
"A treasury of homiletic help, and contains material for many sermons." *British Weekly*
Price per Volume 14s. net

THE GREAT CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES
Three Volumes published

Prayer Out of print at present.

Faith "A vital doctrine, treated systematically and comprehensively." *Irish Presbyterian* **Price 14s. net**

Peace Preachers can use "the treasures of a vast library to help their congregation." *Theology* **Price 11s. 6d. net**

38 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH, 2
T. & T. CLARK

Why they read

THE MOFFATT BIBLE

The Scholar

"I do not think anyone should dispense with this version. It will do more than any commentary to give the ordinary reader an insight into the results of scholarship. It will send the student back to his authorities with a new zest. It will constantly stimulate the expert." The Rev. Canon C. E. Raven, D.D.
Lately Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge

The Minister

"I owe more to James Moffatt's translation of the New Testament than I can ever acknowledge. I always advise teachers and ministers to turn to Moffatt before they deal with any text or passage. His translation is often its own best commentary. And best of all, his words and expressions have a wonderful beauty and felicity of their own." The late Rev. James Black, D.D.

The Layman

"It was not until I read deeply into the Moffatt Bible that I understood what a treasure it is. It may, and frequently does, give us new meanings, but it does not weaken the message. On the contrary, it demonstrates in a wonderful way how up-to-date the Bible is, how surely it marches with the years." Hugh Redwood

The Preacher

"Nothing would so much contribute to a revival of religion as the recovery on a wide scale of the habit of reading the Bible. Dr. Moffatt's translation, because of its clearness and force, has done more towards this recovery than anything else."
The Rev. Dr. James Reid

Those Who Look For Revival

"Dr. Moffatt's translation has done more than any other influence in our generation to help to make people begin again to read the Bible. I can think of no higher praise than this. His Testament makes the personality of the Master stand out, vivid and alive, knowable and real." The Rev. Dr. Leslie D. Weatherhead

NEW AND READY FOR THE 40th ANNIVERSARY OF THE MOFFATT NEW TESTAMENT

The Vest Pocket Moffatt New Testament

from 7/6 net

Note

For the Free Pocket Booklet on Dr. Moffatt's achievement, giving details of all the editions and their prices, you are invited to write to the Publishers

HODDER AND STOUGHTON Ltd., (Dept. A) 42 Queen St., Edinburgh, 2

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 10s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£10, 10s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*